National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CANADIAN TRENDS IN SELECTED FEMALE CRIMES: AN ADAPTED REPLICATION STUDY

by

JOAN ELIZABETH FISHER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-32275-6

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR JOAN ELIZABETH FISHER

TITLE OF THESIS CANADIAN TRENDS IN SELECTED FEMALE CRIMES:
AN ADAPTED REPLICATION STUDY

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED SPRING 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Joan Fisher

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

4 Ivy Avenue

Toronto, Ontario

M4L 2H7

DATED March 4 19 86

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled CANADIAN TRENDS IN SELECTED FEMALE CRIMES:

AN ADAPTED REPLICATION STUDY submitted by JOAN ELIZABETH FISHER in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

J J Hatvany

.....

Supervisor

J M Ross-Labaw

.....

A M Deene

.....

Date April 22/86

Dedication

In loving memory of my sister, Ellen

and

For my friend, Ilze

Abstract

Women's liberation is today a full-blown social movement whose adhererents are dedicated to changing the basic values and norms of this society (Chafetz, 1978). However, it is frequently claimed that this movement is eroding the traditional differences that once clearly defined gender roles between men and women (Adler, 1975). The feminist movement thus poses some rather disconcerting questions regarding the core values of this society and its definitions of appropriate behaviour for both sexes (Chafetz, 1978). Some also believe that technology and women's liberation have equalized women's capacity for male careers, including criminal pursuits (Adler, 1975). For generations, men have been considered the primary perpetrators of most criminal activities. This male dominance is now beginning to change. The female criminal is supposedly responding to changing sex roles and to the feminist movement. Further, it is contended "that women are fast becoming both feared and revered participants in the criminal world" (Steffensmeier, 1979:44). Unfortunately, the scope, depth, and implications of women's criminal activity have traditionally been ignored in criminological research. Only now, as women increasingly assume social roles previously performed by men, have women's illegitimate activities become subjects for study in mainstream criminology.

This thesis presents an empirical analysis of the allegedly changing pattern of female behaviour. It examines Statistics Canada data on females charged by the police to determine whether levels of female crime are indeed changing in Canada. Questions concerning selected female property and violent crimes are clarified and current conceptions of sex differences between female and male criminality are examined. We focus on the types of crime Canadians are involved in, and whether the participation of men and women in these crimes is changing. Finally, the methodological framework adopted by this research forms the basis of an evaluation of the validity of some current views of female criminality, particularly the masculinization of female crime theories of Freda Adler (1975;1977) and Rita James Simon (1975a; 1975b; 1979a; 1979b).[1] Closely adhering to a research design utilized by Steffensmeier

[1]The current "dominant form of masculinization theory is best named women's liberation theory in order to differentiate it from the extremes of the traditional

(1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979), the empirical treatment of these data on persons charged goes considerably beyond that of previous analysts.

---

[1](cont'd) masculinization hypotheses as represented by Lombroso and Freud" (Rollack, 1979:4). Lombroso stated that women by their very nature and role in society are less capable of violence than men. He believed women who do engage in crime are more masculine than are their conformist sisters. For his part, Freud contended that the manifestation of deviance in women can be explained by the presence of a "masculinity complex", behaviour exhibited through women's pursuit of masculine goals such as success, recognition, power, and money.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Timothy F. Hartnagel, for referring me to Steffensmeier's female crime research, and for his comments, suggestions, and patience during the course of this thesis. I am also grateful to my other two committee members, Dr. Sharon McIrvin Abu-Laban and Dr. Anne Marie Decore for their statistical advice and useful comments on drafts of this thesis.

Dr. Leslie Hayduk at the University of Alberta and Dr. John Fox at York University were also helpful in clarifying the methodology employed in Steffensmeier's two American studies on female property and violent crimes.

For computer help, Cliff Kinzel, Chuck Humphrey, Layne Marshal, and Linda Abbott made my terminal sessions considerably less aggravating and more efficient. Linda Abbott also spent many tedious hours entering text, tables, and doing "long distance editing".

I would also like to say thank you to Kerri Calvert for her library assistance and allowing me to monopolize the Statistics Canada crime and population publications from time to time.

Thanks are also due to my friends Jan and Milos Cerny for successfully bribing me with dinners and champagne. My good friend, Donna Bueschkens, was there when I needed her. I am also thankful for the pearls of wisdom given to me by my collegue, Dr. Phyllis Jensen.

My parents, Mary and Reg Fisher, never lost their confidence in my ability to succeed and my brother Jim and his wife, Karen, offered positive reinforcement at many stages of my graduate studies. My family's pride in my academic accomplishments encouraged me to believe in myself and do the best I could.

Finally, Ilze Hobin, who did a hundred and one things, and more. I am indebted to her for her advice, compassion, and inspiration that contributed towards the completion of this thesis. Her thoughtfulness is beyond comparison. I could not have done it without her.

Table of Contents

Chapter — Page

I. Review Of The Theoretical Literature 1

A. Problems With The Traditional Literature 1

B. Theoretical/Analytical Framework 6

Adler 8

Simon 11

Steffensmeier 14

C. Canadian Perspective 15

D. Summary of the Theoretical/Analytical Framework 18

E. Methodological Techniques and Issues 19

Steffensmeier's Analysis of UCR Arrest Data 26

II. Statistical Data Sources And Procedure 30

A. Choice of Data: Persons Charged 30

B. Some Caveats Regarding The Data 31

C. Data Analysis And Presentation 33

D. Computation Of American And Canadian Rates 34

E. Measurement Of Sex Differential 35

Relative Differences 35

Absolute Differences 36

F. Measurement Of Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged 37

G. Presentation Of The Canadian And American Data 38

H. Summary 39

III. Canadian Rates Of Persons Charged 40

A. Persons Charged Rates By Type Of Legislative Category 40

B. Property Crime Persons Charged Rates 42

C. Violent Crime Persons Charged Rates 45

D. Summary 45

IV. Males And Females Charged With Crimes Against Property 47

A. Property Crime Persons Charged Rates 47

B. Measurement Of The Sex Differential 52

Relative Differences 52

Absolute Differences 54

Relative Versus Absolute Differences 58

C. Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged 59

Serious Charges 59

All Charges 63

D. Summary 66

V. Males And Females Charged With Violent Crimes Against The Person 69

A. Violent Crime Rates of Persons Charged 69

B. Measurement Of The Sex Differential 75

Relative Differences 75

Absolute Differences 76

Relative Versus Absolute Differences 79

C. Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged 80

Serious Charges 80

All Charges 83

D. Summary 85

VI. A 'New Female Criminal' in Canada? 88

A. Major Findings 89

B. Contributions of This Study 98

C. Summary 100

VII. References 102

Government Publications 116

Appendix 118

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Canada - Rates of Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population for All Charges, by Legislative Category, 1962-1978	41
2	Canada - Rates of Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population for Selected Property Crimes, 1962-1978	43
3	Canada - Rates of Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population for Selected Violent Crimes, 1962-1978	44
4	Canada - Selected Property Crime Rates of Female and Male Persons Charged Rates (%FC), 1962-1978	48
5	United States - Property Crime Arrest Rates Per 100,000 for Females and Males, and Percent of Female Contribution to Total Arrest Rates, 1960-75	50
6	Canada - Absolute Differences Between Male and Female Rates of Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population for Selected Property Crimes, 1962-1978	55
7	Canada - Selected Property Property Crime Annual Rates of Change and "Average" Absolute Changes in Differences in Annual Rates for Female and Male Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population, 1962-1978	57
8	Canada - Females and Males Charged With Selected Property Crimes as a Percent of Their Respective Sex Cohorts Charged With Selected Serious Crimes, 1962-1978	60
9	United States - Females and Males Arrested for Property Crime as a Percent of Their Respective Sex Cohorts Arrested for Serious (Index) Crimes, 1960-75	61
10	Canada - Females and Males Charged With Selected Property Crime as a Percent of All Charges in Their Respective Sex Cohorts, 1962-1978	64
11	United States -Females and Males Arrested for Property Crimes as a Percent of All Arrests in Their Respective Sex Cohorts, 1960-75	65

12 Canada - Selected Violent Crime Rates of Female and Male Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population and Percent of Female Contribution to Total Persons Charged Rates (%FC), 1962-1978 70

13 United States - Violent Crime Arrest Rates Per 100,000 for Females and Males, And % Female Contribution to Total Arrest Rates for Violent Crime, 1960-77 72

14 Canada - Absolute Differences Between Male and Female Rates of Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population for Selected Violent Crimes, 1962-1978 77

15 Canada - Selected Violent Crime Annual Rates of Change and "Average" Absolute Changes in Differences in Annual Rates for Female and Male Persons Charged Per 100,000 Population, 1962-1978 78

16 Canada - Females and Males Charged With Selected Violent Crimes as a Percent of Their Respective Sex Cohorts Charged With Selected Serious Crimes, 1962-1978 81

17 United States - Females and Males Arrested for Violent Crimes as Percentage of Serious Crimes and Percentage of all Arrests in Their Respective Sex Cohorts, 1960-77 82

18 Canada - Females and Males Charged With Selected Violent Crimes as a Percent of All Charges in Their Respective Sex Cohorts, 1962-1978 84

A1 Population Age 10 Years and Over by Sex, Canada, June 1st 1962-1978 128

A2 Persons Charged With All Charges, by Legislative Category and Sex, Canada, 1962-1978 129

A3 Persons Charged With Selected Property Offences, by Sex, Canada, 1962-1978 130

A4 Persons Charged With Selected Violent Offences, by Sex, Canada, 1962-1978 131

A5 Persons Charged With Selected Serious and Non-Serious (Petty) Types of Offences, Canada, 1962-1978 132

Table of Sources

Tables 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-16, 18

Dominion Bureau of Statistics

1962-71 *Crime Statistics (Police).* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

Statistics Canada

1972-78 *Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics.* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

1973b *Population 1921-1971. Revised Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age Group, Canada And The Provinces.* Ottawa: Information Canada (July). Catalogue #91-512 (Occasional).

1979 *Revised Annual Estimates Of Population By Sex And Age For Canada And The Province, 1971-1976.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada (March). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

1983 *Intercensal Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age For Canada And The Provinces, 1976-1981.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada (September). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

Table A1

Statistics Canada

1973b *Population 1921-1971. Revised Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age Group, Canada And The Provinces.* Ottawa: Information Canada (July). Catalogue #91-512 (Occasional).

1979 *Revised Annual Estimates Of Population By Sex And Age For Canada And The Province, 1971-1976.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada (March). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

1983 *Intercensal Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age For Canada And The Provinces, 1976-1981.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada (September). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

Tables A2-A5

Dominion Bureau of Statistics

1962-71 *Crime Statistics (Police).* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

Statistics Canada

1972-78 *Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics.* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

I. Review Of The Theoretical Literature

Since the late sixties North Americans have indicated increasing concern about the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency. Commissions have studied some of the problems, the media have devoted many of their resources to examining them, politicians have been outraged by their increase and vowed to combat them, and academics in the social sciences have contributed volumes and journal articles dealing with the causes and control of crime and delinquency (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). Conceivably, criminology should be able to provide the layman with some helpful information about crime and delinquency. It should also be able to point out the validity of current and past theories related to criminal behaviour. But, although both public and professional concern has been acute, certain areas of the overall crime situation have been virtually ignored (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). This has been the case with female criminality and delinquency.

A. Problems With The Traditional Literature

Traditionally, social and behavioral science researchers have concentrated on the activities of the male criminal to the exclusion of the female. The research that has been conducted is repeatedly criticized, especially by feminist writers, as being rife with serious inadequacies. Datesman and Scarpitti (1980:4) add that "little more than casual examination is needed to demonstrate that theories of crime and delinquency causation, identity, and career development were developed to fit male models...females are either excluded from all consideration or are assumed to fit the general pattern." Unfortunately, these authors also point out that general patterns of criminal behaviour based upon male role sets are seldom applicable to females. For example, Anthony Harris (1977) argues that the inclusion of the sex variable has dire consequences for most theories. He suggests that the failure to start with the sex variable in theories of criminal deviance "has been the major failure of deviance theorizing in this century" (Harris, 1977:14). Sutherland and Cressey (1970) have also noted that "sex status differentiates criminals from non-criminals to a greater extent than any other trait"

(cited by Fox and Hartnagel, 1979:96).

This lack of scholarly attention to female criminality and delinquency has led to considerable criticism regarding both the content and quality of past research. Shover and Norland (1978) point out that the bulk of the research on female crime has been conducted on underclass offenders unrepresentative of the larger offender population. Most of the literature also makes "no pretense of concern with theoretical issues, and focuses instead on very narrow empirical questions or simple description" (Shover and Norland, 1978:113). In addition, out of the theoretical explanations offered, few attempt to relate female criminality to the "master institutions of society or to political-economic variables" (Shover and Norland, 1978:113). Structural-functional explanations have instead predominated at the structural level of analysis concerning female criminality. Apart from the assertion that female criminality is linked to gender roles, little theoretical specifications were either offered or felt argued. Shover and Norland (1978) believe there was a willingness to assume that the important theoretical issues in female crime were essentially agreed upon. It has also not helped matters that nearly all the attention in recent years has been concentrated on female delinquency and comparatively little interest has been expressed in the criminality of adult females.

Other criticisms levelled at the literature pertain to evidence that the "basic assumptions and technocratic concerns" of previous authors "have produced work that is sexist, racist, and classist" (Klein, 1976:27). A large portion of the early academic material characterizes female offenders as innately depraved, atavistic, and morally deficient (Lombroso and Ferrero, 1959); pathetic and mentally deficient (Glueck and Glueck, 1934); and devious, deceitful, and passive (Pollak, 1950). The following examples further illustrate this point:

> When we reflect upon the character of such women, slaves of depraved and vicious habits, often with health, nerves, self-control, and self-respect broken or destroyed...(we know that) none but a woman can understand the mental vagaries arising from certain physical conditions, the temper, the obstinancy, the waywardness, the lack of will-power, the sway of impulse, all referable to diseased bodies and unstrung nerves, the legitimate result of a life of sin (Johnson, 1898; cited by Chapman, 1980:25).

> We also saw that women have many traits in common with children; that their moral sense is deficient; that they are revengeful, jealous, inclined to vengeances of refined cruelty. In ordinary cases these defects are neutralised by piety, maternity, want of passion, sexual coldness, by weakness and undeveloped intelligence. But when a morbid activity of the physical centres intensifies the bad qualities of women, and induces them to seek relief in evil deeds; when piety and maternal sentiments are wanting, and in their place are strong passions and intensely erotic tendencies, much muscular strength and a superior intelligence for the conception and execution of evil, it is clear that the innocuous semi-criminal present in the normal woman must be transformed into a born criminal more terrible than any man (Lombroso and Ferrero, 1959:151).

> This swarm of defective, diseased, anti-social misfits, then, comprise the human material which a reformatory and parole system are required by society to transform into wholesome, decent, law-abiding citizens (Glueck and Glueck, 1934; cited by Rasche, 1974:314).

Dorie Klein (1976) asserts that these characteristics, uniformly based on implicit and explicit assumptions about the inherent nature of women, have served to maintain a repressive ideology with an extensive apparatus of control. Furthermore, the biological determinism evident in the classical works on female criminality espoused by scholars such as Lombroso and Freud reflects an ideological framework on which later studies such as the Gluecks' "scientific" study of five hundred delinquent women in the 1930s have developed (Steffensmeier and Cobb, 1981). It is therefore maintained that past theoretical work on female crime and delinquency has been built upon a set of nonrational and sexist assumptions which have rarely been explicitly articulated in the work itself (Shover and Norland, 1978). The influence of these taken-for-granted beliefs is seen in the linking of hypothetical gender traits, the employment of the fallacy of objectivism,[2] and by excessive reliance upon postfactum analyses[3] of research findings (Shover and Norland, 1978). Weis (1976:17) sums it all up when he asserts that "in general, theories of female criminal behavior have been sexualized, psychologized, and syllogized".

---

[2] "Objectivism refers to a tendency by social analysts to assume that they know, or to take for granted, the subjective meanings that social actors ascribe to their own actions" (Shover and Norland, 1978:118). This appears repeatedly in past work on sex differentials in patterns of criminality; the meanings of deviant acts have simply been inferred on the basis of some previously developed theoretical or common-sense interpretations of deviance (Shover and Norland, 1978).

[3] "An explanation is constructed which "makes sense" in the light of previously existing "theories" or prevailing gender-role types" (Shover and Norland, 1978:120). Occasionally, the data are selectively interpreted or ignored in order to force such interpretations.

Until very recently, then, feminists concerned with the operation of the criminal law as it relates to women could easily point to the criminological literature and condemn it for its near silence and its sexism when it did speak (Gavigan, 1982). The paucity of scientific information on female offenders is argued to be an additional symptom of the "unimportant" status of women in an unequal society (see, for example, Chesney-Lind, 1980; Gavigan, 1982; Klein, 1976; McIntosh, 1977; Millman, 1975; Rasche, 1974; and Steffensmeier and Clark, 1980). Generally speaking, the "fairer" sex has been viewed as either defrauded or oppressed by religion, medicine, psychology, capitalism, the law, higher education, and even their own mothers (Jones, 1980). History books show that in the past women were almost exclusively associated with, and persecuted for, only certain classes of crime: witchcraft, poisoning, adultery, prostitution, infanticide, and incest. Furthermore, regardless of their offences, women criminals have nearly always taken on the attributes of "fallen" women who have not conformed to social definitions of who they are and what their place is (Chapman, 1980).

Many explanations have been advanced to account for why female criminality has commanded little interest as a subject area in comparison with male criminality. We have already noted that until relatively recently mainstream criminology has failed to acknowledge the existence and significance of the female offender. It was not until the 1970s that the topic of female crime began to attract much attention, largely because of a broader interest in the topic of women fostered by the emergence of the women's movement in the late sixties (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). During the seventies, a considerable amount of information on women, crime, and justice was accumulated and provided much needed documentation in areas such as the disparate treatment of the sexes by the criminal justice system (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). In the past, as female offenders progressed through the criminal justice system the numbers diminished to such an extent that detailed statistical analyses of the type possible with the larger male samples were inappropriate. Sex was seldom included as a subsidiary variable in the analyses. Discussion of the results regarding the female sample, Benson (1976) explains, was often not warranted. A large proportion of the criminological data on women

offenders was and is presented in terms of absolute numbers and percentages. The small number of female offenders has therefore been a major justification for the neglected study of female criminality. Today, however, there exists a more extensive data base than in the past, which permits the identification of issues and trends in female criminality. Researchers are now faced with the important task of bringing to the "centre of the stage the question of the gross differences between male and female crime rates" (McIntosh, 1977:396).

> True, these have been exaggerated; true, they have been explained in some very bizarre ways in the past. Nevertheless, they exist and they raise some important and interesting problems (McIntosh, 1977:396).

Gavigan (1982) points out that two issues result from the statistical concern raised above by Mary McIntosh (1977). First, in order to better understand the gross disparity between the sexes in the official rates of recorded crime, it is necessary to bear in mind the ideologies concerning women implicit in various theoretical perspectives. Female offenders have historically been viewed as either exceptional or individual aberrations that deserved little further study (Simon and Adler, 1979). The significance of the relatively small numbers of women offenders before the courts and in the prisons, both in the past and the present, is that these women are perceived to be abnormal, or at least not quite mentally sound (Prins, 1980). Somewhat related to such perceptions is the second issue, namely, the relationship between equality and crime. This concern has been a recurring theme and the centre of a vigorous debate ever since the mid-seventies when a causal relationship was posited between the women's movement and an increase in women's criminal activity (Gavigan, 1982). Kraditor (1971) writes that female demands for equality "are met first with humour and second with the argument that their realization would contaminate women and thus render them incapable of fulfilling their sacred obligations as wife and mother" (cited by Chesney-Lind, 1980:2). The woman who rejects her "place" and seeks economic and social equality with men is often seen as deviant and flirting with criminality. Smart (1976) adds that this type of logic has over the years been refined to the thesis that even minimal recognition of rights for women will result in a dramatic increase in female participation in criminal transgressions.

B. Theoretical/Analytical Framework

In recent years, Steffensmeier (1978) claims there has been a proliferation of popular and scientific writing on the extent to which changes in the rate and patterns of female criminality have been linked to equality between the sexes, the "emancipation" of women, and even the women's liberation movement itself (see also, Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980).

These writings provide the theme for virtually all current studies on female criminality. It is thus necessary for us to review these writings in order to furnish the present study with the current understandings of female crime that are dominant in the criminological literature. These arguments concerning the women's movement and female crime will not be tested in this study, but are instead presented to offer the reader a context in which to place the methodological techniques and findings of this study. Utilizing this theoretical framework, we will outline the strengths and limitations of the current conceptualizations of female crime upon which to later base a more rigorous and detailed empirical profile of the Canadian female offender.

A common theme is that the criminal activities of women are coming close to resembling those of men in kind and degree. In fact, most observers claim the role of women in crime is responding to a convergence of sex roles and to women's access to illegitimate opportunities. As a result, alarming descriptions of a coming female crime wave and of violent women have appeared in articles and books. Even the traditionally macho skin magazine *Oui* contains comments like the following: "Women criminals today seem to spark a special fear, fantasy and overreaction in male society" (Jones, 1980:3). The women's movement is seen as responsible for the nascent economic independence and increased psychological liberation of the female (Crites, 1976). It is therefore contended that women are developing patterns of "behavior in keeping with their adoption of male roles" (Adler, 1975:95). Or are they?

The supposed link between changes in women's roles and female criminality is not new. In 1950, Otto Pollak noted in *The Criminality of Women* that criminologists since the 1870s have been predicting that:

> ...the progressing social equalization between the sexes and particularly the entrance of women into even wider fields of economic pursuits would lead to an increase in

> the volume of female crime and thereby to a decrease, if not a disappearance, of the sex differential apparent in criminal statistics (Pollak, 1950:58).

Pollak believed that the criminality of women reflected their biological nature in a given cultural setting. Many female crimes, he believed, are thus not detected because of the way in which they are carried out incidental to the culturally defined roles structuring the female sphere of activity: social roles such as homemaker, child rearer, and domestic.

More recently, Meda Chesney-Lind (1980:1-2) asserted that "the fear of defiant women is as old as the history of male domination and...the ubiquity of female subservience has...encouraged men to trivialize or overlook actual female defiance, particularly so long as it does not directly challenge the bedrock of female oppression (woman's status as male sexual property)". A staff report to the United States' *National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence* stated that "the emancipation of females in our society over recent decades has decreased the differences in delinquency and criminality between boys and girls, men and women, as cultural differences between them have narrowed" (Mulvihill et al., 1969:425). Law enforcement officials such as Chief Ed Davis of the Los Angeles Police Department also advanced the position that: "The women's liberation movement has triggered a crime wave like the world has never seen before" (Weis, 1976:17).

Obviously, it would seem that the first priority would be to consider whether, in fact, changes in the rate and patterns of female criminality have indeed occurred (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). Claims regarding the changing character of female crime usually cite police statistics such as the *Uniform Crime Reports* (*UCR*) in the United States or *Statistics Canada Crime Statistics* in Canada. Published by the two countries' federal governments, these statistics are the only continuous national police data available that give the number of persons arrested or charged in a given year, categorized by sex and by age (adult or juvenile). The main support for the "hypothesis that sex differences in crime diminish as the social roles of the sexes are equalized comes from (these) statistics purporting to show a steady increase in the number of women" dealt with by the police relative to men (Steffensmeier and Cobb, 1981:37; see also, Jensen and Eve, 1976; and Sutherland and Cressey, 1970).

Steffensmeier and Cobb (1981) also state that arrest statistics are used to make two observations concerning the (American) data: (1) that there has been a numerical decline in the sex differential in arrests over the last forty years (see, Johnson, 1978; Reckless, 1973; and Sutherland and Cressey, 1970), and (2) that women have been closing the gap in the commission of serious and traditionally male crimes (see, Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975a; 1975b; 1979a; 1979b).

Adler

Documentation of the female crime wave was first widely publicized in 1975 when Freda Adler published her book *Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Offender*.[4] Adler is an American criminologist who rose to prominence on the strength of a logical fallacy; that is, she noticed that the renewed women's movement of the sixties paralleled apparently phenomenal increases in female crime. She purported to document the nature and extent of the changing pattern of female crime in the United States by examining it from a sociological perspective, taking into account the social roles of women in American society. She proposed that the "social revolution of the sixties has virilized its previously docile female segment" (Adler, 1975:87). Furthermore, "women have lost more than their chains, they have lost many of the restraints which kept them within the law" (Adler, 1975:24).

> This dark side of the movement for full equality has been overlooked by everyone, including the scientific community...But the patterns are beginning to surface that are too clear to ignore...Like her sisters in legitimate work, the female criminal is fighting for her niche in the hierarchy. She knows too much now to return to her former role as a second-rate criminal, confined to such "feminine" crimes as shoplifting and prostitution (Adler, 1975; cited by Chapman (1980:50)).

If we ignore the illustrations and elaborations given in *Sisters in Crime*, Adler makes only a few major assertions regarding trends in female crime (Terry, 1979). Her essential claim is that there is a current female crime wave which many prison administrators, police officials,

---

[4]Chapman (1980) states that Adler's arguments were summarized in her article, "The Rise of the Female Crook," published in *Psychology Today* and later incorporated into a working paper for a major United Nations conference. Chapman (1980) also states that as a consequence of this conference, her arguments received international as well as national attention.

and other law enforcement authorities will not even admit exists. Adler believes the facts show that it not only exists but is increasing at an alarming rate, and, for major crimes, she claims that the rate of increase for females is greater than that for males. Women, according to Adler, are committing the same crimes as men at yearly rates of increase as high as six or seven times faster than those for males. In addition, while the absolute number of males arrested exceeds that of females, arrest rates among females are rising nearly three times faster than those for males. She believes that women are no longer accepting the traditional sex-role stereotypes and have moved into greater public participation in the social order. This is especially evident via movement into the occupational structure. The end result of these circumstances is the "masculinization" of female behaviour in various respects, the most pertinent here being that of criminal behaviour. Adler contends that masculine-feminine boundaries in crime are becoming blurred as male and female criminal behaviour becomes more similar. Technological equalizers have also been responsible for decreasing the differences in physical strength between men and women; for example, a woman can wield a gun physically as well as a man, and thus equal him in committing a violent crime (Rollack, 1979). The physical concomitant of the violent act is further aided by her increasingly criminal role which allows her to be more assertive while at the same time placing her in positions of greater frustration and causing her to act more aggressively. In view of this situation, Adler believes the rate of female increase will result in future female crime rates approaching those of males. The "new female criminal" is also increasingly participating in previously male-dominated types of crimes such as white collar offences, property crimes (burglary and auto-theft), and violent crimes (aggravated assault and robbery).

Adler's position is clearly that criminal activity is a male prerogative, and that the "new female criminal" is breaking with her sex role. She also equates the struggle for formal equality with the realization of substantive equality, suggesting that women have "arrived" (Gavigan, 1982). Terry (1979:201) claims that Adler's work "stands out as significantly representative of the female crime literature which sees large and significant change in both the social order and

the realm of criminal behavior". Adler can be considered an initial proponent of a new alternative theory to the old "sexist, racist and class bound theories" presented by earlier theorists (Rollack, 1979).

The bases for Adler's assertions include reliance upon female labour force participation statistics, *Uniform Crime Report* arrest statistics, and, finally, anecdotes, media reports, and personal interviews with offenders that are sporadically introduced to buttress her arguments.

Adler's conclusion that levels of female violent crime have increased has been supported by Bruck (1975), Nettler (1974), Rosenblatt and Greenland (1974), and Woodward and Malamud (1975). Partial support for her findings has also come from Ward et al. (1979).

Since their publication, Adler's findings have also been challenged by arguments assailing the shortcomings of her research. Some critics point out that Adler made no attempts to correlate the *magnitude* of increases in labour force participation with the *magnitude* of increases in female crime (Terry, 1979; see also, Crites, 1976). Neither are there any attempts to control the drastically different numerical bases of male and female arrests. By focusing strictly upon rate of increase, Adler exaggerates gains in female crime simply because there is less of a base to begin with, and forecasts future rates with similar bias (Terry, 1979). She also conveniently excludes the absolute arrest figures from the data presentation. This is a crucial ommission, given the fact that the exceedingly low base rates for many women's crimes, especially violent ones, are such that very small absolute increases can be translated easily into very large percentage increases. Miller (1983:60) states that:

> It is this sort of statistical distortion, along with a complete disregard for the possible effects of change in the sex-age composition of the population at risk, that leads Adler to conclude that with the exception of murder and aggravated assault, the picture of female arrest rates rising faster than male arrest rates is a consistent one across the board.

Steffensmeier et al. (1979) further criticize Adler for neglecting to make the crucial comparison between male and female levels of violent crime. In this respect, Adler's claims of burgeoning female arrest rates are suspect since she presents them in isolation and apart from comparative male arrest rates for violent crime.

Terry (1979:202) also argues that the "utilization of anecdotes and the like as supporting data is perhaps most questionable since" we have "no means of assessing the validity of such data nor the generalizability thereof even if it should be valid". He further criticizes Adler for not using this sort of evidence consistently and for contradicting herself. For example, Adler quotes a criminal informant who indicates that she, and presumably others, "regard the women's movement derogatorily as composed of a bunch of lesbians", but Adler nevertheless retains her commitment to the causal significance of the women's movement for the increase in female crime (Terry, 1979:202). In another instance, Adler describes the great increases in violent crime among women, but at another point cites statistics indicating that murder among women is not increasing. As Terry (1979:202) pointedly observes: "one is left with the impression that Adler has a message to deliver and is not about to allow facts or evidence to prevent her from delivering that message".

Simon

Rita James Simon is another prominent researcher in the area of female criminality and has come to represent the major figure in the behavioural sciences in terms of reporting on trends in female crime (Terry, 1979). In her book *Women and Crime* (1975) Simon offers her description of female involvement in crime in the United States. Her analyses are heavily dependent upon, although not restricted to, arrest statistics published annually in the *Uniform Crime Reports*. She conducts a thorough and rigorous examination of statistics that describe trends in the proportion of women arrested, convicted, sentenced, and paroled over a twenty year period in the United States, concluding that women are *less* violent today than two decades ago. According to Terry (1979:202), she also exercises a greater degree of caution and objectivity in the interpretation of findings and, unlike Adler, "does not demonstrate the delight and pride in discovering that female offenders are becoming just as mean and rotten as males".

Simon finds that women are more criminally involved today than at any time since the end of World War II, and probably before that. However, significant increases in female crime are relatively restricted to certain types of offences only and do not represent the sorts of changes observed by Adler. Simon contends that women are engaging in more white collar and occupational crimes, specifically larceny, forgery, fraud, and embezzlement, and not in crimes of violence or in the traditional female crimes of prostitution or child abuse.

> If present trends continue, in twenty years women will probably be involved in white-collar crimes in a proportion commensurate with their representation in the society. The fact that female arrests have increased for these offenses and not for all offenses is consistent both with the opportunity theory and with the presence of a sizable women's movement (Simon, 1979a:8).

She indicates that larceny increases are most responsible for overall female crime gains.

Simon accounts for the lack of increase in female violent crime as being due to the reduction of frustrations among women brought about by the women's movement. She believes that "as women's employment and educational opportunities expand, their feelings of being victimized and exploited will diminish, and their motivation to kill becomes muted" (Simon, 1975a:2; see also, Reckless and Kay, 1967; Rosenblatt and Greenland, 1974; and Ward et al., 1979). Her forecast for female violent crime indicates greater decreases through time as a consequence of progress exhibited by the movement.

In attempting to make sense of the increases in female crime, Simon reviews several explanations. Foremost among these is the argument that stability and/or decreases in levels of female crime are accounted for by the effects of the women's movement as a reducer of frustrations for women. She contends that women's criminal involvement "typically arises out of the frustration, the subservience, and the dependency that have characterized the traditional female role" (Simon, 1975a:2). Importantly, however, Simon feels increases in female crime are not *directly* linked to the movement.

> In the few years since the contemporary women's movement has crystallized as a solid social movement...it has attracted a good deal of attention. It would be reasonable to assume, therefore, that it has had some effect on the psyche, the consciousness, and the self-perceptions of many women in American society. But the extent to which it has motivated those women to act outside the law in order to gain financial rewards, vengeance, and/or power is still too early to say...Before women's

> contributions to crime can be expected to match their representation in society, women must have the opportunities for committing these crimes...Even if we assume that women's psyche and motivations are no different than men's in their willingness to commit crimes, unless their opportunities expand, it is unlikely that women's crime rates will show a big increase (Simon, 1975a:105-107).

Like Adler, she proposes that as males and females become more similar occupationally, their opportunities for crime will become more similar and, consequently, their criminal behaviour will eventually coincide. This, according to Simon, is an assimilation of females into the occupational sphere and not a masculinization of female behaviour.

Despite her careful and thoughtful analysis, Steffensmeier (1978; 1980a) criticizes Simon for not taking into account the large contribution of larceny-theft arrests to the serious crime category, particularly when analyzing arrests for *all* crimes. He feels that she also overlooks rising levels of violent crime among females when present levels are compared with past levels. Unlike Adler (1975), Simon does make the crucial comparison between male and female arrest rates, but Terry (1979) claims that the data used by Simon do not provide the kinds of answers Simon is seeking in attempting to assess either the trends of female crime or the variations in types of female crime. Specifically, Terry (1979) believes numerous problems of interpretation arise when relating changes in arrest rates for females through time with alterations in the labour force participation of females. This is especially true when we cannot identify the relative participation of identifiable components of the female population in either the arrest rates or in the labour force. These circumstances make it difficult to determine whether those who are participating in the labour force are those who are also committing the crimes or whether those who are not in the labour force are committing the crimes. A further criticism regarding Simon's work is that available American data indicate that the women who have entered the labour force in recent years have, for the most part, taken jobs that have typically been "women's jobs" (Miller, 1983). Women are generally not in positions where they can commit serious property crimes in the course of their work. There is also evidence that what appear to be serious white collar crimes are often only petty property crimes; for example, credit card fraud, shoplifting, and signing someone else's name to stolen personal cheques to be

cashed for petty amounts (Miller, 1983). Futhermore, Miller (1983) argues that the women's movement and the increase in the property crime rate of women would appear to occur almost simultaneously. She suggests that both might be the result of some prior shift in socioeconomic circumstance.

Steffensmeier

Theoretically, Steffensmeier appears to adopt the same position as both Adler and Simon when it comes to women's liberation and female labour force participation (Terry, 1979). Yet, he assesses the consequences of these activities differently. Steffensmeier (1978) believes that the movement toward greater equality for the sexes should lead to a convergence between the sexes in levels of property crime, but not in levels of violent crime. Like Simon, his findings indicate that the convergence is far greater for larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement than for other property crimes. Burglary, auto-theft, and stolen property were just as male dominated offences in 1975 as in 1960. He suggests that crimes such as burglary involve skills that are usually acquired within a criminal subculture and women thus far have lacked ties with such networks.This further dimension, ignored by both Adler and Simon, suggests that male and female levels of crime will converge only when females participate in these pro-criminal subcultures (Terry, 1979). Mere increased participation of women in the labour force is not enough to increase female crime. In sum, Steffensmeier argues that the "new female criminal" is "more a social invention than an empirical reality" (Steffensmeier, 1978:566; see also, Crites, 1976; Shover and Norland, 1978; and Weis, 1976). Women, according to Steffensmeier, are still typically nonviolent, petty property offenders, primarily perpetrators in larceny-theft (mainly shoplifting) and in fraud (bad cheques and welfare fraud).

> These traditionally female offenses reflect traditional sex-determined roles in legal and illegal marketplaces: from shopper to shoplifter, from cashing good checks to passing bad ones, from being a welfare mother to being accused of welfare fraud, and so on (Steffensmeier, 1978:580).

He argues that larceny-theft is not a serious crime and that alterations in police arrest practices tend to increase female arrest rates for larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement, reflecting

shifting orientations toward these offences and, consequently, female arrestees.

Laurel Rans (1978) also analyzes the trends in *UCR* Type I crimes through the use of ratios. She contends that the calculation of proportional changes clarifies not only the role of women in crime but also the entire crime picture. Her data show that there were more violent crimes in 1975 than in 1960, but the proportion of violent crimes to property crimes remained almost stable. In short, she finds no proportionate change in the female share of violent crime since it remained at approximately 10 percent and the proportion of women arrested for violent crimes decreased. Like Steffensmeier et al. (1979), she concludes that "skyrocketting" female arrests are an exaggeration.

Further support for Steffensmeier comes from Bartel (1979) who conducted an analysis of determinants of female participation in criminal activities, using *UCR* arrest data in an economic model of crime. She also examines the connection between the women's movement and crime in the seventies, but comes to the opposite conclusion from Adler and Simon. Bartel (1979) finds the partial effect of labour force participation on female crime to be negative, and concludes that the dramatic rise in female crime was not due to an increase in female opportunities in the labour market.

C. Canadian Perspective

In Canada, the gross disparity between the sexes in the official rates of recorded crime has been addressed either implicitly or explicitly in some of the official reports studying female offenders in Canada (Gavigan, 1982). For example, in 1938, the Archambault Commission reported that female delinquency was not a particularly serious problem in Canada.

> ...when the sick have been deducted, the number of trainable women is very small, and the women prisoners apart from young prisoners who are capable of deriving benefit from continued education would constitute a small class (*Report of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada: The Archambault Report*, 1938:145).

Regarding the prisoners of the Kingston Penitentiary for Women in 1938, the Commission concluded that:

> ...murder, attempted murder, and manslaughter, account for approximately 47 per cent, or nearly half. These women are not a crime problem but are of the occasional or accidental offender class, who have been carried away by the overmastering impulse of the moment, often the outbreak of long pent up emotion (*The Archambault Report*, 1938:147).

During the sixties, attention was drawn away from the traditional criminological theories and focused upon the nature of the structural policies and practices of the criminal justice system in its response to the female offender (Solicitor General, 1978:12). In 1969, three noteworthy publications made some contribution to what was known then about the female offender in Canada. One of these, *Criminal Law and Women Offenders* stated that:

> The criminal law in Canada is built upon a nineteenth century philosophy of the role of punishment in the control of anti-social behaviour...Canadian criminal law also reflects a nineteenth century view of the status of women. Women who encounter the criminal law, the administration of criminal justice or ultimately correctional institutions, are treated in accordance with a traditional concept of a woman's role that is no longer necessarily appropriate in the 1970s (Royal Commission on the Status of Women, 1969:365).

Similarly, the *Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections: The Ouimet Report* (1969) outlined the differences between male and female criminality in Canada. This report, for information purposes, was invaluable in its description of attitudes towards females, the types of crime committed by women, and differences in sentencing practices in regard to male and female offenders (Solicitor General, 1978).

> There are certain differences in the criminality of women, as compared with men...the most outstanding single difference is that of numbers...many more men than women are dealt with by the police and courts...There is some indication that the difference between men and women offenders tends to be lower in highly industrialized societies than in less developed ones (*The Ouimet Report*, 1969:389).

> Differences between women offenders and men offenders can hardly be discussed adequately without relating them to differences in male and female roles in society generally. The lower incidence of crime involving violence may, to some degree, represent constitutional differences between males and females in terms of physical strength, but appears likely to be still more clearly related to differences in social roles and expectations (*The Ouimet Report*, 1969:391).

Finally, the Canadian Corrections Association published the *Brief on the Woman Offender* in 1969. It dealt with the special problems of women offenders in relation to law enforcement, court proceedings, correctional treatment, and detention facilities for females.

Traditionally, Stang Dahl and Snare (1978) contend that methods dealing with female offenders favour informal (non-custodial) rather than formal (custodial) means to control the behaviour of women. For example, *The Archambault Report* (1938) recommended that non-custodial sentences, such as probation, should be applied even more generously to female offenders.

We therefore encounter many explanations to account for the comparatively lower crime rate of Canadian women. The different social positions and social expectations of the sexes may be two of the reasons for the ratio (Royal Commission on the Status of Women, 1969). Notwithstanding these tentative explanations, however, it is clear that the perceived nature of female criminality "has never lost its intimate connection with the 'understanding' of the inherent nature of women" (Gavigan, 1982:42).

The most recent government publication on the female offender in Canada is the *Report Of The National Advisory Committee On The Female Offender* (1977a). This report is almost entirely concerned with examining certain problems relating to how the female offender is handled within the system, primarily in the correctional sphere (Solicitor General, 1978). However, in an accompanying statistical report to this document entitled, *The Female Offender: Selected Statistics*, some data are presented which give an indication of female criminality in Canada. Regarding the argument that female crime is rocketting ever upward, this report cites Canadian figures that do not quite accord with claims by either Adler (1975) or Simon (1975a; 1975b).

> In 1964, there were ten times more men than women charged with criminal code offences, by 1974 this ratio had decreased to 6 to 1. This implies that the number of females charged with such offences is increasing at a faster rate than males which is borne out by the fact that the number of women thus charged increased 176% from 1964 to 1974 while for males the increase was 74%...With the exception of "rape/other sexual offences", which is predominantly male crime, the increase in the number of women charged for each criminal code offence outstripped the increase for males. The most noticeable variation occurred in fraud offences with the increase for females (306%) being five times greater than was the increase for men (59%) (*The Female Offender - Selected Statistics: Report Of The National Advisory Committee On The Female Offender*, 1977b:7).

A number of topics are suggested for future research, which include the collection of data

missing from our knowledge of female offenders. The report also indicates that reduced paternalism or chivalry on the part of police and the judiciary will likely lead to increased charges being laid against women as well as longer prison sentences. Furthermore, it is argued that increased opportunities for involvement by women in a wider range and number of criminal pursuits is a probable consequence of increasing numbers of women entering and remaining in the labour force (Solicitor General, 1977b).

Marie-Andree Bertrand has also made a significant contribution to the study of female criminality in Canada. A survey conducted by Bertrand (1973) of arrest data in Canada and the United States revealed that female criminality was increasing proportionately in North America at a faster pace than male criminality. There were also more women arrested for fraud in the seventies than in 1960. In addition, she found that women were more involved in crimes of violence such as robbery and assaults than in the early sixties and that here again the increase in female involvement was proportionately greater than that of men (cited by Solicitor General, 1978). Rosenblatt and Greenland (1974) also found that female violent crime had risen.

In a study analyzing long-term Canadian data on female crime in relation to the rate of involvement of women in the familial role and participation in extrafamilial roles, Fox and Hartnagel (1979:103) found "it is primarily in the area of property crime, and particularly theft, that female arrest and conviction rates have shown the greatest increase in recent years". They concluded "that changes in various aspects of women's structural position in society affect female crime rates" (Fox and Hartnagel, 1979:96). Rollack (1979) supports this finding in her analysis of persons charged statistics in the Province of Alberta.

D. Summary of the Theoretical/Analytical Framework

We have focused upon the major dimensions of the work of three prominent researchers in the area of female criminality, all of whom utilized national arrest statistics in their data analysis: Freda Adler, Rita James Simon, and Darrell J. Steffensmeier. These researchers examined the relationship between the social equality sought by members of the

women's movement in the late sixties and the apparent rise in the female crime rate which seemingly occurred within the same time frame. The rise in female consciousness has reputedly led to a progressive convergence of male and female crime rates. Adler claims that the convergence is characterized by alarmingly large increases, particularly in the violent crime categories. In contrast, Simon concludes that the most significant increases for female crime are in the property crime categories, especially those that are occupationally-related. Last, Steffensmeier provides a rigorous examination of the arrest data that includes a crucial comparison between male and female arrest rates. His work utilizes both relative and absolute measures of the sex differential in crime rates.

We also outlined the Canadian research addressing the disparity between the sexes in the official rates of recorded crime. It was shown that the same themes dominant in the American female crime literature have also been transferred to the Canadian scene. It is readily apparent that what we need is a resolution of the 'numbers' issue concerning women. We should also keep in mind the complexity of the criminal justice system and the need to consider factors apart from the formal sanctions revealed in police statistics. As Gavigan (1982:50) states: "in many ways, women have been invisible both as victims and offenders; the significance of this invisibility is finally beginning to be understood."

E. Methodological Techniques and Issues

Steffensmeier (1978) claims that most contemporary analysts like Adler and Simon use arrest statistics in an inappropriate and misleading fashion. Specifically, he feels these analysts fail to answer certain key questions concerning female crime:

1. Are the rates of increase in female property and violent crime arrests greater than the increases in the American female population during the period under study?
2. Are the rates of increase for females greater than those for males?
3. Within the female arrest population, has there been an increase in the proportion arrested for both property and violent crimes?

With these questions in mind, Steffensmeier sets out to clarify questions related to both property and violent crime as well as to compute arrest rates to determine the extent of change in female crime since the early sixties. He attempts to sort out which of the current dominant perspectives on female criminality, namely Adler's or Simon's, is more valid. As a starting point in his critique Steffensmeier examines the reliability of the data used.

The usefulness, reliability, and validity of official crime statistics as a measure of levels and trends of criminality continue to be controversial. Many researchers maintain that official statistics do not provide meaningful indices of criminal activity (Black, 1970; Wilson, 1968). However, despite these methodological shortcomings, researchers continue to use official reports because of their accessibility and because they are often the only crime data available. Official data, such as the *Uniform Crime Reports* and *Statistics Canada Crime Statistics*, are the only nationwide data currently available that given an indication of: 1) the characteristics of apprehended offenders and, 2) the population units that are most responsible for the levels and trends of crime. Nonetheless, Rosenthal and Steffensmeier (1978:1) state that "...while offenses known to the police (reported crimes) provide a measure of crime levels in the society as a whole, they do not indicate which segments of society (e.g. age, race, etc.) are most responsible for these levels". This information can only be obtained from arrest statistics which provide information on offender characteristics. Unfortunately, these authors also point out that *UCR* arrest statistics do not give an accurate profile of American crime because of inadequacies in police reporting and difficulties involved in collecting any local data on a national basis. Problems with the *UCR* data also relate to the practices and procedures followed by the *UCR* in presenting their arrest figures. Many of these problems can be generalized to the Canadian scene.

The first major problem with the reporting practices in the *UCR* and *Statistics Canada Crime Statistics* is that arrest (persons charged) figures and percentage change tabulations in arrests (persons charged) from year to year are expressed in absolute numbers as the volume of arrests (persons charged). Steffensmeier et al. (1979:219) states that this reflects "both an

increase in the number of people living within the jurisdiction of the agencies reporting in time-1 and the addition of population covered by agencies reporting for the first time since time-1". These figures reflect both a change in the number of people living within the jurisdiction of the agencies reporting in a given comparison year and the change in actual levels of crime. Rosenthal and Steffensmeier (1978) explain that this means that, since the population of the country has been increasing, not correcting for this increase tends to show that the volume of arrests (persons charged), and therefore crime, is increasing even though the *rate* of arrests (persons charged) in the population may not have changed. As a result, this type of reporting practice tends to increase the reported levels of crime. Similarly, the figures do not take into account that the demographic character of the population is in considerable flux; for instance, sizable increases in crime can be attributed to rural-urban population shifts and to age distribution changes (Chilton and Spielbeiger, 1971; Wellford, 1973). These demographic changes in the population are generally hidden in the police statistics as presented in the *UCR* (Rosenthal and Steffensmeier, 1978).

Refined Crime Rates

Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979) (see also, Rosenthal and Steffensmeier, 1978) outline a method for computing arrest rates for specific population categories such as sex, age, and race. The method involves using *UCR* arrest data combined with available census information to compute arrest rates which take into account the demographic characteristics of the population under consideration. The result is refined arrest rates that provide a meaningful measure of the extent and distribution of crime in the United States. These refined arrest rates are particularly useful for making comparisons over time in absolute and relative levels of crime both within and between population units or groups. For example, while the relative gap between the sexes has perhaps narrowed for some crimes, the absolute gap may have correspondingly widened for all crimes (Steffensmeier et al., 1979). In relation to female crime we can determine whether

the rate of increase in female arrests is greater than the increase for males over the same time period - a clear advantage in using sex-specific rates. Steffensmeier assumes a random distribution of measurement error across the sexes. In this manner, he is reasonably safe in using the *UCR* arrest data for purposes of examining relative differences in levels of crime between males and females over a given time period.[5]

Steffensmeier also presents calculations that show the percent of *all* arrests which are female, adjusting for the sex composition of the population under study. This type of calculation is a proportion whose usage is now preferred to that of percentage or ratio measures of change (Steffensmeier, 1978; see also, Anderson and Zelditch, 1968). These latter data, he explains, are derived from a part-to-part rather than a part-to-whole comparison and are quite unstable when the population base is small (frequently the case with female crime figures). In this way Steffensmeier examines the relative gap in male and female crime and also describes changes in relative differences. He also looks at absolute changes to document the predominantly male nature of certain types of crime both in the past and in the present, particularly violent crime. He emphasizes, however, as noted earlier, that relative and absolute differences do not always change in parallel fashion.

Steffensmeier's computations are also a method for rectifying problems associated with changes in coverage of the *UCR* over time.[6] He uses the following

---

[5]If, however, the aim is to use the *UCR* arrest data as an absolute measure of crime levels for females a specified year, or if the aim is to assess relative differences in crime levels over time, then the problem of measurement error becomes insurmountable. Rosenthal and Steffensmeier (1978:19) state that "while there are exceptions (e.g. arrest data on homicide), it is generally the case that if we are interested in levels of female crime then it is only when female-to-male comparisons are the object of analysis that the *UCR* arrest data can be safely used".

[6]Steffensmeier uses the word *coverage* because it stresses the fact that the units covered in the *UCR* are not random or representative of the country's population as a whole. He states that the term *sample* "has often been used (see, for example, Wolfgang, 1963), but since it has connotations of a representative or random

formula to compute his arrest rates:

ARREST RATE/100,000 = M/P X N/T X 100,000

where **M** = the arrest volume figure given in the appropriate *UCR* table.

P = the population volume figure from the same *UCR* table.

N = the estimated number of persons who would be in the *UCR* table if coverage were complete (for example, total United States population, total rural population).

This figure is taken from estimates of the United States population.

T = the estimated number of persons in the target category for whom the arrest figures are given (for example, males in rural areas, people under 18 years of age.

This figure is also taken from estimates of the United States population.

Steffensmeier's method enables us to calculate arrest rates per 100,000, 10,000, or 1,000, for any specified population unit, provided that the *UCR* gives the requisite arrest volumes.[7] The methodology, presented in greater detail in Chapter II, corrects for the demographic composition of the population unit or category under consideration in relation to the larger population covered by a specific *UCR* table. For instance, the *UCR* may report crime statistics from population centres of 2,500 and over and thus not include the American population living in centres under 2,500 population - a sizable chunk of the American people when we consider the total American population. This problem is not nearly as extensive here in Canada

---

[6](cont'd) process of selection," the word coverage is used instead (Rosenthal and Steffensmeier, 1978:20). This decision also relates to the fact that biases change from year to year.

[7]Rosenthal and Steffensmeier (1978) explain that their method is similar to that discussed in Volume II of the *Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence* (1969). They state that their method is a more general one and is formulated to allow the reader to clearly ascertain how refined arrest rates can be calculated. The method is not to be confused with efforts to simply adjust arrest volumes for changes in age structure (Ferdinand, 1970) or to compute total offence rates adjusted for age structure changes.

because of the more complete population coverage practiced by Statistics Canada.

A caveat is in order at this point. While the computation of refined arrest rates maximizes the usefulness of official police data, it does not overcome the vulnerability of these statistics to methodological problems. Even though police statistics currently provide the best indicator of criminal activity on a national scale, they should not be interpreted as an actual measure of the amount of crime that occurs because an unknown amount of unreported or undiscovered crime will never be reflected in these statistics (Statistics Canada, 1977). There are also problems with these data because they have been collected over a period of time. Variations in reporting practices, changes in police policy, procedures and/or resource allocation, and revisions in legislation are some of the factors not readily apparent or easily detected. National statistics are also invariably marred by a lack of uniformity or standardization in the collection process. There may be gaps in the acquisition of valuable information and incomplete processing of the collected data. The systematic biases and vulnerabilities of official police data to measurement error are therefore commonly acknowledged. Previous mention has been made of the fact that these error factors are assumed to be randomly distributed between the sexes across time in Steffensmeier's schema.

> It is safer, therefore, to compare sex differences in arrest rates over a given period of time than to use the rates as either an absolute measure of levels of female crime for a specific year or to use them to assess changes in levels of female crime over time, e.g., to compare arrest rates of females today with those of a decade ago (Steffensmeier et al., 1979:220).

The statistics of given crimes also vary in their degree of reliability. For example, homicide statistics are both the most reliable and stable measure of violence because they have a high reporting rate and a higher clearance rate (80%) than for any other offence (Steffensmeier et al., 1979). Conversely, robbery is a crime which has both a low reporting and low clearance rate (25%) and aggravated assault has a low reporting rate but a moderately high clearance rate (60%).

Steffensmeier et al. (1979) explain that the perhaps questionable reliability of data for various offences is not crucial in their analysis because it is more important to concentrate on changes in the sex distribution of arrests for these crimes. Changes in the arrest levels themselves are of less consideration in this type of methodology.

Another problematic area associated with arrest statistics is the FBI's use of totals as an arrest index. In the United States, selected serious offences establish an "Index in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program" representing a Type I offence group (criminal homicide, including murder and non-negligent manslaughter and manslaughter by negligence; forcible rape; robbery; aggravated assault; burglary; larceny-theft; and auto-theft). As a group these particular offences "represent the most common local crime problem" (Simon, 1975a:33). These offences are all serious crimes "either by their nature or due to the volume in which they occur" (Simon, 1975a:33). Simon herself reports primarily on Type I offences and only comments on some of the Type II offences because there has been a change in the female arrest pattern or because they are offences for which arrest rates for females are consistently high, such as larceny and fraud-embezzlement. However, a problem exists with the presentation of crime incidence in this fashion to determine whether crime is increasing or decreasing. Steffensmeier (1980:1082) believes these gross totals are "typically the sum of all arrests or the sum arrests for serious crimes, and represent convenient attempts to simplify and summarize large masses of data" (see also, Norland and Shover, 1978). In Steffensmeier's opinion, the components which make up the total "may not hang together and the same total may thus reflect very different arrest patterns" (Steffensmeier, 1980:1082). This situation is further aggravated when offences covering a range of seriousness are included in the same category, not permitting an assessment of variation within offence categories. For instance, the offence of larceny-theft is an excellent example:

> To define larceny as a serious crime and include it with such offences as murder, robbery, and so on...is to use the term "serious" in a rather shortsighted and nondiscriminating fashion. Many arrests for larceny are for shoplifting of items of small monetary value and, therefore, are nonserious compared to other index offences (e.g. murder, robbery) and are not regarded as very serious in the opinion of the general public (Steffensmeier, 1979:47).

Steffensmeier's Analysis of UCR Arrest Data

The foregoing methodological/empirical problems form the basis of Steffensmeier's contentions regarding the pitfalls of Adler's and Simon's descriptions of female criminality in the United States. In two separate studies on female crime, Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979) analyzed property crime and violent crime, respectively, in an attempt to overcome some of the shortcomings associated with previous research on female crime trends.

Property Crime

Steffensmeier (1978) used five indices of property crime for the years 1960 to 1975: burglary, larceny-theft, auto-theft, fraud-embezzlement, and stolen property - a mixture of both Type I and Type II offences in the *Uniform Crime Reporting Program*. An overall measure of property crime was also employed that combined the arrest volumes for burglary, larceny-theft, and auto-theft.

Steffensmeier's findings show that the levels of property crime for these offences increased substantially since 1960 with increases occurring for each of the property crimes examined. However, despite the absolute increases in levels of female crime for these crimes, Steffensmeier found that when he took the relatively low size of the initial base rate into account, the greatest increases occurred in female arrests for larceny-theft. With the exception of stolen property, he also found that male and female levels of property crime have shown some convergence since 1960. He pointed out that this does not necessarily mean that females are catching up with males in committing property crimes since absolute differences between the sexes are still large. These differences have generally increased so that female property

crime levels continue to lag far behind those of males, the exceptions being the offences of larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement. Increases in larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement, however, do not provide evidence that females have moved into more masculine offences or white-collar crime. Instead, Steffensmeier believes that in large part such increases are the result of changes in participation in shoplifting and fraudulent activities such as passing bad cheques. These latter offences are ones wherein female participation has been noteworthy for a long time and offences which are not tied to the occupational participation of females. According to Steffensmeier, education and increased employment of women in the labour force since World War II have tended to undermine the traditional sex-linked division of labour. He points out that, increasingly, women are managers of the pocket book and are handling a larger proportion of the family's financial and marketplace activities. They are therefore now presented with greater opportunities to defraud and steal.

Finally, when Steffensmeier examined changes within the female arrest population, refining the figures to take into account changes in the national female population, he found mixed results. In particular, among females arrested for *serious* or *Uniform Crime Reports' Index* crimes, the percentage of women arrested for larceny-theft increased but decreased for burglary and auto-theft. Among *all* females arrested, he found a large increase in the percentage of women arrested for larceny-theft, but only minimal increases in the percentage arrested for burglary, auto-theft, fraud-embezzlement, and stolen property. Overall, Steffensmeier concluded that female arrest rates will not match male arrest rates in the near future even if current trends for these offences continue. In fact, for them to converge would require "probably the greatest behavioural shift that the world has ever seen" (Terry, 1979:206).

Violent Crime

With regard to crimes of violence by women, Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found that levels of female violence had increased since their base year of 1960 in an intrasex comparison of male and female arrest rates. However, the rise in female violence appeared to be levelling

off. They documented observed declines in crimes of violence since 1974, clearly contradicting Adler's (1975) findings and her conclusion of a female crime wave.

Four indices of violent crime were used by these researchers for the years 1960 to 1977: murder/non-negligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, and other assaults. An overall measure of violent crime was utilized that combined all of the former offences plus negligent manslaughter.[1] In addition, a Serious Violent Crime index was also compiled which combined murder, robbery, and aggravated assault. Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found small fluctuations in these data, and concluded that overall differences between the sexes remained about the same as they were in 1960. The only gaps that narrowed between men and women were for robbery and other assaults. In terms of absolute differences, they found that the absolute gap widened for each of the violent offences studied, revealing the predominantly male nature of violent crime both in the present and the past.

Focusing on changes within the arrested population, Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found that of those females arrested for serious or index crimes, the percentage of women arrested for violent crimes had actually decreased. When murder, robbery, and aggravated assault were combined into the Serious Violent Crime Index, there was a sizable decrease from 20.3 (1960) to 10.1 (1977) in the percentage of Index crime arrests of women consisting of violent crimes. Among *all* arrested females, the percentage of females arrested for violent crimes held generally stable, with only a slight movement in the direction of becoming more violent. A parallel pattern existed for males wherein a small increase was observed in the proportion of male arrests for violent crimes. Steffensmeier et al. (1979) were faced with divergent conclusions based on the data dealing with changes within the arrested population. On the one hand, the profile of the female offender became less violent, when only arrests for serious crimes were considered, as a result of sharply rising rates of larceny-theft among females. Yet, when arrests for all crimes were considered, the profile of the female offender did not become less violent but remained about the same as it was two decades earlier.

---

[1]Negligent manslaughter is not listed as an Index offence in the *UCR*'s classification of crimes, but treated as a violent crime.

Regarding both of these studies on female crime trends, Steffensmeier has the advantage of several years of research literature on female crime and the effects of the women's movement upon female behaviour before him (Terry, 1979). He relies heavily upon the *Uniform Crime Reports* in conducting his analysis of property and violent crime and provides a considerably more rigorous analysis of female crime trends than either Adler or Simon (Terry, 1979). Especially significant in these analyses is the manner in which he calculates relative rates of change and absolute rates of change in order to control for differences in base rates of participation in criminal transgressions by men and women. His resultant sex-specific rates refute the projections that predict that male and female arrest rates will converge by the year 2000.

The foregoing literature review has served to develop both a theoretical/analytical framework and to identify the different methodological techniques and issues raised by Steffensmeier and other analysts. Based on this review, the following hypotheses will be tested. they are primarily based on Steffensmeier's two American studies of property crime (1978) and violent crime (1979) and use the measures from these studies to address the sex differential between male and female crime rates. We will therefore use both relative and absolute types of measurement to describe the pattern of female criminality in Canada.

1. We anticipate that the rates of females charged with property crime have increased, and that the relative gap between male and female levels of persons charged with property crimes has decreased. In absolute terms, males will still be further ahead in their propensity to be charged with property crimes.
2. We anticipate that there will be substantial increases in rates of females charged with violent crime, but that such increases will be either matched or exceeded by males. The relative gap between male and female levels of persons charged with violent crime will be expected to have decreased. Similar to property crime, in absolute terms, males will again be further ahead in their propensities to be charged with violent crime.

II. Statistical Data Sources And Procedure

A. Choice of Data: Persons Charged

The data for this study come from national crime statistics routinely published by Statistics Canada for the years 1962 to 1978. These data furnish the number of persons charged by police for both adult[9] and juvenile males and females. The choice of 1962 as the starting point was dictated by the commencement of the Uniform Crime Reporting System on January 1, 1962. This new method of reporting police data allowed for the publication of more complete and accurate data on crime in Canada than was formerly possible. Prior to 1962, police reporting methods were marked by wide variation as well as poor coverage in terms of the number of police departments reporting to Statistics Canada (Fox and Hartnagel, 1979; see also Giffen, 1976; McDonald, 1969; *Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections*, 1969; and Zay, 1963). Overall, the trend analysis is limited to a sixteen year period due to another change in the reporting of police statistics, this time a publication change. Specifically, in 1979 Statistics Canada ceased publishing sex-specific juvenile persons charged statistics as part of the reported volume of police charges. This change dictated 1978 as the end point for this study. Sixteen years, in any event, provides a sufficient time period to assess Canadian trends in female and male patterns of persons charged.

Six indices of property crime are used in this study: breaking and entering, theft over $200,[10] theft under $200, theft-motor vehicle, fraud, and stolen goods.[11] The two categories of theft over and under $200 were also combined into one category, simply designated as "theft", for the purpose of drawing comparisons with the American larceny-theft data.[12] All three theft

---

[9]All persons over the age of 16 years, or such other age as may be directed in any province.

[10]$50 until a 1972 legislative change which raised the dollar value of the theft categories to $200, no doubt to account for inflation.

[11]Includes both possession and receiving of stolen goods/property.

[12]Steffensmeier (1978, 1980a) emphasizes the distinction between grand larceny ($50 and over) and petty larceny (under $50). He states that many criminologists have erroneously assumed, at least up 1973, that grand larceny was included in *Uniform*

categories are therefore utilized in the data analysis in an effort to measure the proportionate contributions of each to property persons charged rates for both the sexes. An overall measure of property crime, the Property Crime Index, combines the offences of breaking and entering, theft (including both over and under $200), and theft-motor vehicle.

Concerning violent crime, four indices are used in this study: murder,[13] wounding (includes attempted murder), robbery, and other assaults (not indecent). An overall measure of violent crime, the Violent Crime Index, combines murder, manslaughter, wounding, and robbery. In addition, murder, wounding, and robbery are aggregated into an index of Serious Violent crimes.

B. Some Caveats Regarding The Data

This study utilizes national data for *persons charged* and not data for crimes known or reported to the police. In contrast, the studies on property and violent crime by Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979), respectively, are based on *arrest* data from the *Uniform Crime Reports*. Unfortunately, in Canada, arrest data are not available separately in the government publication of official police statistics. A person is counted as charged when an Information (Form 2, Criminal Code) is laid against an individual whose identity has been established. These data include arrests, summonses to appear, appearance notices, and warrants to apprehend. Therefore, persons charged rates do not equal arrest rates, but only offer rough comparisons between the Canadian and American police data. The two terms are used interchangeably when comparing police data for Canada and the United States, but should not be considered as identical data.

These data also only reflect the volume of persons charged in a given year. Official police data do not tell us the number of persons involved in a single offence or if a person

---

[12](cont'd) *Crime Report* arrest data. However, *Uniform Crime Report* arrest statistics on larceny-theft have always combined total arrests "larceny $50 and over" and "larceny under $50". Statistics Canada, however, reports "grand" and "petty" theft as two distinct categories, namely, theft over and under $200.

[13]In 1976 the Criminal Code of Canada was amended reclassifying murder from capital and non-capital murder to first and second degree murder.

charged for one crime was also charged for one or more crimes of a less serious nature.[14] We do not even know the role played by the person who allegedly committed the crime. All we can say is that X number of persons (male or female, adult or juvenile) were charged for allegedly committing crime Y in year Z (Rollack, 1979).

Police data for different offences also reflect differences in the "ease" of law enforcement; it is generally easier to "solve" by charge violent crimes such as murder. The data we present are therefore only partially offence rates indicative of the types of crimes with which Canadian males and females are charged. Instead, these data reflect criminal case mortality inherent in the operation of the North American criminal justice system. As indicated in an oft-quoted remark by Sellin about criminal statistics: "the value of a crime rate for index purposes decreases as the distance from the crime itself, in terms of procedure, increases" (cited by Wheeler, 1967:318). However, the greatest gap of all is no doubt the one between the crime itself and the initiating procedure (Wheeler, 1967).

The limitations associated with these official data have been widely discussed by academics (see, for example, Giffen, 1976; Normandeau, 1970; Wheeler, 1967; Wolfgang, 1963). Analysts lament that these data do not provide breakdowns of populations of persons charged (arrested) and types of offences into sociologically and/or theoretically meaningful units (Terry, 1979). One purpose of Steffensmeier's methodology is to show how these statistics can be used more appropriately and meaningfully. Nonetheless, we cannot ignore the vulnerability of official police data to measurement error. But, as Mukherjee and Fitzgerald (1981:136) point out, "until better methods of record-keeping become practicable and other means of assessing the phenomenon of crime (for example, victim surveys) become viable, the existing official statistics are the best sources of data". In Canada, police statistics currently provide the best indicator of criminal activity on a national scale; therefore, these statistics suit the needs of the present study. These data permit us to differentiate the type of crimes for which Canadians are likely to be charged and to examine relative differences in selected crime

---

[14]Statistics Canada employs a multiple offence rule where only the most serious offence is scored when several offences occur in one incident.

levels between males and females over a given time period (Steffensmeier, 1978). However, Steffensmeier (1978) cautions that it is risky to use female crime data in the absolute form without taking into account the population of females involved where the gross disparity in the frequencies between the sexes becomes obvious.

C. Data Analysis And Presentation

Closely following Steffensmeier's formula for computing refined sex-specific arrest rates per 100,000 population, persons charged data from *Statistics Canada Crime Statistics* were divided by Statistics Canada June 1st census[15] and intercensal population estimates for each year 1962 to 1978 inclusive.[16] For comparison purposes with the American arrest data, these rates of persons charged per 100,000 are calculated separately for males and females on the basis of the population of persons aged 10 and above, the population at risk, since few persons under the age of 10 are charged by police. Both juvenile and adult persons charged are therefore combined in this study. This procedure takes into account sex and age distributions in the population. Mukherjee and Fitzgerald (1981) emphasize that the only way to insure comparability between the sexes is through using the absolute police data in this fashion. It is now possible to determine whether the rate of increase in female charged is greater than the increase for males. Any change can also be expressed in both relative and absolute terms of differences between the sexes.

---

[15]Census years during the period between 1962 and 1978 are 1966, 1971, and 1976.
[16]Preliminary intercensal population estimates are later revised in census years using data for interprovincial migration from the files of Revenue Canada and data for emigration from the family allowance files. The totals for immigrants, births, and deaths are thus updated using the latest figures available. Closure errors were recalculated and assigned using a linear distribution for the years 1971-1976 (March, 1979) and 1977-1978 (April, 1983) (Statistics Canada, 1981).

D. Computation Of American And Canadian Rates

Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979) used the following formula to compute property and violent crime arrest rates for persons age 10 and over:

ARREST RATE/100,000 = M/P X N/T X 100,000

where **M** = the arrest volume figure given in the appropriate *UCR* table.

P = the population volume figure from the same *UCR* table.

N = the estimated number of persons who would be in the *UCR* table if coverage were complete (for example, total United States population, total rural population). This figure is taken from estimates of the United States population.

T = the estimated number of persons in the target category for whom the arrest figures are given (for example, males in rural areas, people under 18 years of age). This figure is also taken from estimates of the United States population.

Canadian sex-specific rates of persons charged were derived using the following formula:

PERSONS CHARGED RATE/100,000 = M/P X 100,000

where **M** = the volume of persons reported charged by the police given in the appropriate Statistics Canada crime table, and

P = the population volume figure of persons aged 10 and above from Statistics Canada June 1st census and intercensal population estimates.

Values for both M and P were derived for males and females for each year 1962 to 1978 inclusive. The N and T components of Steffensmeier's formula were unnecessary in this formula due to Statistics Canada's more complete coverage of the national population.[17]

---

[17]The crime data published by Statistics Canada include police reports from communities with populations of 750 and over, including urban areas policed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP). In addition, reports from communities with populations of less than 750, townships, districts, and municipalities, also policed by the RCMP and OPP are included. However, some urban municipalities are excluded because: (1) They had less than 750 population, although they had a police force; (2) Communities with no police force, although their population was 750 and over; and (3) Police departments in communities of populations greater than 750 that did not submit reports to Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada, 1962-1978).

E. Measurement Of Sex Differential

This study uses two principal methods of measuring change in the sex differential between male and female persons charged rates for property and violent crime: one is relative differences, the other absolute. Changes in relative differences are the principal concern of the present research; however, following Steffensmeier's schema, absolute differences are also indicated to document the predominantly male nature of certain crimes both in the past and more recently. Steffensmeier's reliance on relative differences follows the precedence of other research on sex differentials in crime levels (for example, Pollak, 1950; Reckless, 1973; Reckless and Kay, 1967; and Ward et al., 1979) and research on sex and race differentials in income (for example, Farley and Hermalin, 1972; and Featherman and Hauser, 1976).

Relative Differences

To determine whether the relative gap between male and female persons charged rates has narrowed or widened since 1962, we calculated the percentage that the female persons charged rate contributes (%FC) to the combined male and female persons charged rate for each offence.

$$\%FC = \frac{\text{rate of females charged}}{(\text{rate of males charged} + \text{rate of females charged})} \times 100$$

Steffensmeier (1980a:1084) says that "algebraically the %FC is equivalent to the proportion of all arrests which are female, adjusting for the sex composition" of the population. It represents a ratio of the rates that assumes that the male and female populations are equal. He believes that shifts in the sex composition of the population can lead to misinterpretations of small sex differential changes. In expressing change, a narrowing of the sex differential (an increase in the %FC) represents a female gain relative to males; a widening (a decrease in the %FC) represents a female loss. Steffensmeier and Cobb (1981) believe this criterion is generous and probably exaggerates female gains due to the low base levels of female arrests and rising arrest levels of both sexes over the years.

Absolute Differences

To determine whether the absolute gap narrowed or widened, we subtracted the female persons charged rate from the male persons charged rate for each year of our property and violent crime analysis. We also computed the "average" absolute change in the annual rate between the sexes for each offence selected in the analysis using the following type of formula:

$$\frac{\text{1975 male rate} - \text{1962 male rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1} - \frac{\text{1975 female rate} - \text{1962 female rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1}$$

This computation measures differences in the "average" annual rate where the annual rate is equal to an individual absolute unit. In other words, it represents the proportionate annual increase in the rate of persons charged; that is, it is a linear measure. This computation is slightly different from the traditional calculation of the sum of X divided by N that, in contrast, measures the average of the annual differences. Both are valid measures, but offer different interpretations of absolute change. Steffensmeier's method is also one way of getting around the difficulty of statistical distortion caused by low female, high male base rates. Another method to reduce this statistical distortion is to use the following formula and use this measure in conjunction with other measures of change in the annual rate when discussing percentage change in the persons charged rate over a time period.[18]

Absolute Change in the Annual Property Persons Charged Rate =

$$\frac{\text{1975 (female/male) rate} - \text{1962 (female/male) rate}}{\text{Number of Years}}$$ [19]

Increases and/or decreases in the absolute gap depend partly on whether persons charged rates in specific categories are rising or dropping for both the sexes and on dramatic differences in base rates between males and females. Steffensmeier (1980a) says that given the larger rates of males, when arrest rates are rising, male gains in absolute terms will be larger than those of females. Similarly, when arrest rates are declining, male losses in absolute terms

---

[18]This additional statistic was suggested by Dr. Anne Marie Decore.
[19]For the Absolute Change in the Annual Violent Persons Charged Rate, the 1962 rates were subtracted from the year 1977.

will be greater since they have so much more to lose. We should also remember that absolute and relative differences do not always change in parallel fashion. Steffensmeier (1980a) points out that it is possible for the relative gap to narrow while the absolute gap widens (or vice versa). This will be borne in mind during our analysis of this study's findings. For comparability with Steffensmeier's (1978) figures for property crime, data were computed for the years 1962 to 1975 in addition to the data computed for 1962 to 1978. For violent crime, the analysis involved the years 1962 to 1977 for comparability with the American data, as well as the period from 1962 to 1978 with the extra year of Canadian data. Sex-specific annual rates of change are also indicated to demonstrate in greater detail the changing pattern of increases and decreases in persons charged.[20]

F. Measurement Of Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged

Expanding on the type of analysis performed by Simon (1975a; 1975b; 1979a; 1979b) we aggregated the volumes of persons charged with murder, wounding, attempted murder, robbery, breaking and entering, theft over and under $200, and theft-motor vehicle into a Canadian index of *serious* crimes. After calculating the percentage of women charged in each of the individual property and violent offence categories and the combined property and violent crime indices as proportions of this index of serious crimes, we then repeated the same computation using *all* charges[21] as the denominator in these proportions. We analyzed male charges in the same fashion and compared findings.

The above types of analyses demonstrate changes within the female and male charged populations, changes in the types of crimes for which the sexes are charged, and especially changes in the profile of the Canadian female offender. Steffensmeier and Cobb (1981) believe

---

[20]Rates of change are a common type of ratio. Blalock (1972:37) states that "in computing such a rate we take the actual increase during the period divided by the size at the *beginning* of the period." For example, if the female persons charge rate for property crimes increases from 284.3 to 322.2 per 100,000 population between 1977 and 1978, the annual rate of change would be: $\frac{322.2 - 284.3}{284.3} = +0.133$.

[21]Excludes traffic offences.

that large shifts in one or a few offence categories can reduce the percentage of total arrests accounted for by other offence categories. These authors argue that this can conceivably lead to misleading conclusions about changes in the types of crimes for which men and women are arrested. Regarding serious crimes, we should also be aware that offences within a single category of the selected serious crimes can vary greatly in degree of seriousness and suspect involvement. For example, a woman can be charged for a violent, masculine[22] crime such as robbery, yet have engaged in the traditionally female role of a "sexual decoy" (Steffensmeier and Cobb, 1981).

G. Presentation Of The Canadian And American Data

The statistical tables, figures, and related narrative are grouped sequentially into three chapters of data analysis: Canadian Rates Of Persons Charged (Chapter III), Females and Males Charged With Crimes Against Property (Chapter IV), and Females and Males Charged With Violent Crimes Against the Person (Chapter V).

In relation to direct comparisons between the Canadian and American data, we will present these data as follows. The number of years encompassed by the Canadian arrest data is the sixteen-year period between 1962 and 1978. Steffensmeier (1978) only studied the fifteen-year period between 1960 and 1975 in his property crime analysis, and Steffensmeier et al. (1979) studied the seventeen-year period between 1960 to 1977 in their violent crime analysis. The Canadian data set, in comparison, only commences in 1962, which limits the starting point of the Canadian trend analysis to that point. Therefore, when drawing direct comparisons between the two countries' police data, the following schema will be used: for the property crime analysis, data will be compared only for the years 1962 to 1975, and for the

---

[22]Murder, aggravated assault, other assaults (not indecent), weapons, robbery, breaking and entering, theft-motor vehicle, vandalism, and arson are commonly referred to as masculine crimes in the theoretical literature. These crimes typically require stereotyped male behavior, involve masculine skills and techniques, and are usually committed by males. They are commonly defined as crimes involving physical strength and daring, elements of coercion and confrontation with the victim, and/or specialized skills (Steffensmeier, 1980a; see also Cohen, 1955; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Pollak, 1950; and Smart, 1976).

violent crime analysis, data will be compared for the years 1962 to 1977. Note, however, that differences in legal nomenclature and data incompatibilities suggest exercising caution when drawing conclusions from these data concerning comparative crime trends. Specifically, differences in reporting procedures, population coverage, units of count, and definitions inhibit such conclusions from the Canadian and American data sets. When not drawing direct comparisons between the Canadian and American data, the analysis will be directed at the entire-sixteen year period between 1962 and 1978 available with the Canadian data.

H. Summary

The literature on female criminality generally attests to the fact that there is a great need for testable hypotheses in criminological research. Research designs are called for that take into account some of the difficulties of data collection in this area. Steffensmeier's analyses demonstrate the importance of calculating refined sex-specific police rates. He argues this is the most appropriate and meaningful way in which to examine official police statistics because changes in criminal arrests can be studied both over time and between population units. This methodology is ideally suited to cohort analysis, especially if the intent is to make comparisons between actual cohorts. Data derived from Steffensmeier's methodology should provide social scientists, legislators, correctional administrators, and criminal justice planners with more accurate Canadian statistics. Wolfgang (1963:708) also observes that "to continue using the traditional *UCR* expression of percent changes in volume of arrests from one year or decade to another is to perpetuate almost meaningless measures. These percent changes would be useful only if the population capable of contributing to the phenomenon was perfectly stable." If people are concerned about "whether crime is in fact increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable among specified population groupings, then, unless population is static, only population-based or refined arrest rates can validly provide the kind of information desired" (Rosenthal and Steffensmeier, 1978:19). Steffensmeier's procedures thus offer us a more adequate method with which to document Canadian male and female patterns of persons charged.

III. Canadian Rates Of Persons Charged

Although this study focuses on sex differences in Canadian persons charged rates for selected property and violent crimes, we will first present persons charged data that combine both the sexes for the years 1962 to 1978. This chapter, then, provides an overall profile of Canadian offenders over the sixteen year-period and a general context to view the gender based differences in the pattern of Canadian criminality presented in Chapters IV and V. Through an analysis of the general pattern of criminal activity, characterized by rate fluctuations in individual categories, we can assess where general changes have occurred and then later determine the extent to which gender differences contributed to the overall pattern of change.

A. Persons Charged Rates By Type Of Legislative Category

Table 1 documents persons charged rates per 100,000 population by type of legislative category (excluding traffic offences). A look at the overall rate of persons charged in Canada indicates that legal infractions increased by 45.0 percent from 2758.5 to 4000.6 between 1962 and 1978. A small decline (6.7 percent) in these data is seen between 1967 and 1972 but the rates then progessively increase to a total gain of 23.2 percent by 1978.

Looking now at the individual legislative categories of offences, Table 1 reveals percentage increases in persons charged rates for all categories except Municipal By-Laws, whose rate declined by 53.8 percent over the sixteen years. The most dramatic percentage change, however, is in the rate of persons charged with Federal Statute (Drug) violations, which increased by 6,862.2 percent. The next largest percent increase between 1962 and 1978 is in the rate of Criminal Code charges. The 1978 figure of 1990.2 for Criminal Code infractions represents a 93.2 percent increase over the 1030.2 percent figure for 1962. Charges for Provincial Statutes increased by a moderate 14.0 percent with no upward trend indicated. The 2.7 percent increase in Other Federal Statute charges is even less significant.

As noted above, the largest increases are in the categories of Federal Statute (Drug) and Criminal Code charges. Persons charged with drug offences increased in part because of

TABLE 1

CANADA

RATES[1] OF PERSONS CHARGED[2] PER 100,000 POPULATION FOR ALL CHARGES[3], BY LEGISLATIVE CATEGORY, 1962-1978

YEAR	ALL CHARGES[3]	CRIMINAL CODE[4]	DRUG FEDERAL STATUTES[5]	OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES[6]	PROVINCIAL STATUTES[7]	MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS
1978	4000.6	1990.2	257.6	168.9	1451.1	132.8
1977	3934.3	1928.0	294.8	154.7	1415.8	140.9
1976	3802.1	1903.4	288.3	127.7	1341.7	140.9
1975	3785.1	1813.4	244.4	113.2	1466.9	147.2
1974	3686.7	1697.0	271.3	120.1	1435.6	162.7
1973	3536.6	1633.6	252.0	117.4	1329.9	203.8
1972	3246.8	1498.7	130.7	118.5	1268.5	230.3
1971	3297.0	1482.7	93.7	125.1	1348.9	246.6
1970	3335.1	1451.3	78.6	125.3	1416.4	263.5
1969	3432.5	1363.8	32.3	189.4	1559.4	282.9
1968	3409.2	1332.7	20.1	175.2	1559.2	322.0
1967	3478.3	1222.7	11.8	163.6	1728.9	313.5
1966	3357.6	1176.6	5.2	172.4	1706.8	296.5
1965	3199.2	1129.4	4.2	144.3	1647.5	273.9
1964	3073.4	1176.3	3.4	153.2	1510.9	229.6
1963	2911.0	1083.5	3.8	134.9	1387.7	301.1
1962	2758.5	1030.2	3.7	164.4	1272.5	287.6

[1] All Canadian rates in this table and following tables are based on a population of persons age 10 years and over. They have also been rounded by the computer to one decimal point.
[2] Counted when an Information is laid against a person whose identity is established (includes arrests, summonses to appear, appearance notices, and warrants to apprehend).
[3] Excludes traffic offences.
[4] Includes murder, manslaughter, attempted murder, sex offences (including rape), assaults (not indecent), robbery, breaking and entering, theft of motor vehicle, theft over and under $200[8], having stolen goods, frauds, prostitution, gaming and betting, offensive weapons, arson, bail violations, counterfeiting currency, disturbing the peace, escaping custody, indecent acts, kidnapping, public morals, obstructing public peace officer, trespassing at night, wilful damage (public and private), and other Criminal Code offences.
[5] Includes offences under the Narcotic Control Act as well as Controlled and Restricted drugs under the Food and Drug Act.
[6] Includes offences under the Bankruptcy Act, Canada Shipping Act, Customs Act, Excise Act, Immigration Act, Juvenile Delinquents Act, and other Federal Statutes.
[7] Includes offences under the Liquor Act, Securities Act, and other provincial statutes.
[8] $50 until a change in legislation in 1972 which increased the value of stolen goods to $200.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

some increased usage of drugs, but also because of an increase in law enforcement activity (Statistics Canada, 1976). Approximately three-quarters of persons charged with drug violations represent charges of possession of cannabis under the Narcotic Control Act (Statistics Canada, 1976). Drug statistics, similar to those for prostitution and gaming and betting, may indicate the degree of enforcement of these laws rather than measuring the extent of the behaviour. However, it is more likely that the increase in the number of persons charged with drug violations reflects a greater usage of hashish and cannabis within the Canadian population (Solicitor General, 1977).

A better indication of the general direction in which Canadian Criminal Code persons charged rates have been moving since 1962 is shown in Tables 2 and 3. Therein persons charged rates have been calculated for each of our selected property and violent crimes. Let us first examine the persons charged data for property crime presented in Table 2 and then expand our analysis to the persons charged data for violent crime displayed in Table 3.

B. Property Crime Persons Charged Rates

The data in Table 2 reveal large rate changes for persons charged with selected property crimes: (1) breaking and entering increased 130.6 percent from 132.5 to 305.6, (2) theft increased 106.9 percent from 237.4 to 491.1, (3) theft over $200 decreased 7.2 percent from 69.1 to 64.1, (4) theft under $200 increased 153.7 percent from 168.3 to 427.0, (5) theft-motor vehicle increased 48.0 percent from 64.6 to 95.6, (6) fraud increased 101.9 percent from 69.9 to 141.1, and, (7) stolen goods increased 153.1 percent from 28.6 to 72.4. The overall property crime index including breaking and entering, theft, and theft-motor vehicle also rose by 105.4 percent from 434.4 to 892.3. Percentage increases are therefore realized in all of our property crime categories except theft over $200. The decrease in the latter category can no doubt be attributed in part to the 1972 legislative change that increased the dollar value of the theft categories from $50 to $200. Between 1971 and 1978 the persons charged rate for theft over

TABLE 2

CANADA

RATES OF PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION FOR SELECTED PROPERTY CRIMES, 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX[1]	BREAKING AND ENTERING	THEFT[2]	THEFT OVER $200[3]	THEFT UNDER $200[3]	THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE	FRAUD	STOLEN GOODS
1978	892.3	305.6	491.1	64.1	427.0	95.6	141.1	72.4
1977	853.5	294.6	459.6	59.1	400.5	99.3	130.2	69.2
1976	880.6	295.4	485.0	57.1	427.9	100.2	124.2	68.0
1975	852.4	285.0	461.9	53.8	408.1	105.5	114.3	63.4
1974	772.7	247.8	423.9	51.4	372.5	101.1	103.6	59.5
1973	714.5	223.0	403.8	47.2	356.6	87.7	103.1	56.6
1972	682.0	206.6	390.6	88.6	302.0	84.8	100.3	57.4
1971	688.3	208.7	400.1	102.2	297.9	79.5	99.6	56.9
1970	661.7	203.0	377.2	100.2	277.1	81.5	97.9	52.8
1969	607.6	198.9	326.4	85.3	241.2	82.3	87.4	47.1
1968	572.6	180.7	314.5	77.8	236.7	77.4	77.6	41.7
1967	510.0	153.2	284.5	69.8	214.8	72.2	68.6	36.0
1966	488.7	142.1	280.7	69.7	211.0	65.9	67.7	31.8
1965	475.1	141.9	263.9	65.9	198.0	69.3	63.7	31.0
1964	481.7	148.0	261.0	63.5	197.5	72.7	70.5	32.3
1963	465.4	147.5	251.4	64.9	186.5	66.6	70.5	32.3
1962	434.4	132.5	237.4	69.1	168.3	64.6	69.9	28.6

[1] Includes breaking and entering, theft over and under $200[3], and theft-motor vehicle.
[2] Includes both theft over and under $200[3].
[3] $50 until 1972 legislative change of theft categories to $200.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE 3

CANADA

RATES OF PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION FOR SELECTED VIOLENT CRIMES, 1962-1978

YEAR	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX[1]	SERIOUS VIOLENT[2]	MURDER[3]	WOUNDING[4]	ROBBERY	OTHER ASSAULTS[5]
1978	237.0	49.3	2.8	8.9	37.6	187.4
1977	232.6	50.0	2.8	8.6	38.7	182.3
1976	228.5	47.8	2.6	8.3	36.9	180.4
1975	224.6	49.7	2.6	8.1	39.0	174.6
1974	221.1	43.9	2.5	8.4	33.0	176.9
1973	214.2	38.9	2.2	8.1	28.6	174.8
1972	199.8	35.4	2.2	7.5	25.6	164.2
1971	197.7	34.8	2.1	7.5	25.2	162.6
1970	192.5	34.6	1.8	6.8	25.9	157.6
1969	179.4	31.0	1.7	7.1	22.2	148.2
1968	173.7	29.0	1.6	6.2	21.2	144.4
1967	162.5	23.9	1.2	4.3	18.4	138.3
1966	159.2	22.3	1.3	4.1	16.9	136.8
1965	146.2	21.0	1.1	4.1	15.8	124.9
1964	139.7	22.8	1.1	4.2	17.5	116.7
1963	127.8	20.3	1.3	4.2	14.7	107.2
1962	120.0	20.0	1.1	4.3	14.6	99.7

[1] Includes murder (capital and non-capital/first and second degree)[3], manslaughter, wounding, attempted murder, robbery, and other assaults (not indecent).
[2] Includes murder, wounding, attempted murder, and robbery.
[3] In 1976, the Criminal Code was amended reclassfying murder from capital and non-capital to first and second degree. Only these forms of homicide are included in our murder category.
[4] Includes attempted murder.
[5] Excludes indecent assaults.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

$200 fell by 37.3 pefcent from 102.2 to 64.1. In comparison, during the same time period, the persons charged rate theft under $200 rose 43.3 percent from 297.9 to 427.0. For the other rates of persons charged with property crimes, indications of a levelling off are apparent between 1975 and 1978 for breaking and entering, theft (including both theft over and under $200), and theft-motor vehicle. Finally, the substantial percentage change in the stolen goods persons charged rate over the sixteen years is probably indicative of a general police practice to charge those persons charged with theft with possession of stolen goods as well.

C. Violent Crime Persons Charged Rates

Canadian persons charged rates for selected violent crimes have also risen between 1962 and 1978. Table 3 presents these persons charged data: (1) murder increased 154.5 percent from 1.1 to 2.8, (2) wounding increased 107.0 percent from 4.3 to 8.9, (3) robbery increased 157.5 percent from 14.6 to 37.6, and, (4) other assaults increased 88.0 percent from 99.7 to 187.4. The persons charged rate for the violent crime indices similarly rose: the violent crime index by 97.5 percent from 120.0 to 237.0 and serious violent crimes even more substantially by 146.5 percent from 20.0 to 49.3. The persons charged rate for murder evidenced an increase of 56.3 percent between 1968 and 1974 but only a 12.0 percent increase between 1974 and 1978. Increases in the rate of persons charged are also noted with respect to wounding, robbery, and other assaults, but these increases have been fairly consistent over the sixteen years.

D. Summary

Looking at the data shown in both Tables 2 and 3, we easily see that the majority of offences that Canadians were charged with between 1962 and 1978 were property-related. The percentage increases in property crime in Table 2 demonstrate significant increases in the commission of theft-related offences. In comparison, the incidence of persons charged with violent crimes against the person in Table 3 is considerably less. Smaller increments in the rate of persons charged with violent crime index offences (murder, manslaughter, wounding,

attempted murder, robbery, and other assaults) lead us to conclude that property crime index offences (breaking and entering, theft, and theft-motor vehicle) demonstrate a faster rate of growth over the sixteen years. The relative importance of crimes that yield monetary gains to offenders (crimes against property) can be directly inferred from the data in this table.

The data in Tables 2 and 3, particularly the data for breaking and entering, might well affect a Canadian citizen's feeling of residential and commercial security (Statistics Canada, 1980). The harm done to society as a result of these criminal behaviours is seen in lost legitimate output due to the participation of labour and capital inputs in illegal endeavours, private expenditures on crime prevention (for example, burglar alarms, insurance claims against loss risks, value of personal time devoted to protection), the destruction of assets, and finally, the cost of apprehending, convicting, and correcting offenders (Avio and Clark, 1976). With regard to violent crimes, both the threat of and the actual forfeit of human capital occur as a result of these offences. These factors are usually referred to as the 'social costs of crime'. The influence of materialistic concerns, an unstable national economy, and the increased availability of property are also no doubt reflected in police data, especially the property crime data.

Let us now examine the extent of the sex differences in this general pattern of criminal activity and describe the empirical profile of the Canadian female offender between the years 1962 to 1978.

IV. Males And Females Charged With Crimes Against Property

The findings of this study address Canadian patterns of female persons charged to determine whether levels of selected female crime are indeed changing. Sex differences in persons charged rates are also compared over a sixteen-year time period. In this chapter, our data analysis tests the following hypothesis:

1. We anticipate that the rates of females charged with property crime have increased since 1962, and that the relative gap between male and female levels of persons charged with property crime has decreased. In absolute terms, males will still be further ahead in their propensity to be charged with property crimes.

Translated into specific questions, this hypothesis speaks to the following key issues:

1. Have there been increases in rates of females charged with property crime in Canada?
2. Have the gaps between male and female persons charged rates for property crimes decreased?
3. Within the population of females charged, have there been increases in the proportion of females charged with selected property crimes?
4. Legal nomenclature aside, are there any similar data patterns evident from the Canadian and American police data for property crime, 1962-1975?

A. Property Crime Persons Charged Rates

Table 4 shows rates of persons charged with property crime per 100,000 population for the sixteen year period from 1962 to 1978. As stated in the Chapter II, the analysis of these data will focus on two time periods (1962 to 1975 and 1962 to 1978) since Steffensmeier (1978) presents comparable American data only up to 1975.[23] For comparative purposes again, Canadian data for persons reported charged by the police with "theft over $200" and "theft under $200" have been aggregated into one category, simply designated as "theft". Unless the

---

[23]Unless otherwise noted, all figures in parentheses following the Canadian data in this chapter denote Steffensmeier's (1978) findings of his study of changing levels of female property crime in the United States.

TABLE 4

CANADA

SELECTED PROPERTY CRIME RATES OF FEMALE AND MALE PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION AND PERCENT OF FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO TOTAL PERSONS CHARGED RATES (%FC)[1], 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX			BREAKING AND ENTERING			THEFT			THEFT OVER $200		
	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC
1978	322.2	1475.8	17.9	28.2	589.6	4.6	284.5	702.5	28.8	15.4	113.9	11.9
1977	284.3	1434.9	16.5	25.1	569.9	4.2	249.8	673.9	27.0	13.1	106.1	11.0
1976	304.9	1467.5	17.2	25.5	570.6	4.3	271.3	702.9	27.9	13.0	102.1	11.3
1975	275.3	1439.3	16.1	22.5	551.9	3.9	244.5	683.1	26.4	11.7	96.6	10.8
1974	246.3	1306.9	15.9	19.5	479.5	3.9	219.9	630.9	25.8	10.2	93.1	9.9
1973	222.0	1213.4	15.5	18.2	430.4	4.1	197.7	612.6	24.4	7.7	87.2	8.1
1972	201.8	1167.2	14.7	13.8	401.3	3.3	182.9	600.4	23.3	21.8	156.1	12.2
1971	194.7	1185.8	14.1	13.5	405.4	3.2	176.5	625.6	22.0	22.1	183.0	10.8
1970	166.0	1160.7	12.5	12.2	395.1	3.0	150.0	606.0	19.8	19.6	181.2	9.8
1969	132.2	1085.4	10.9	10.4	388.2	2.6	118.4	535.5	18.1	15.7	155.3	9.2
1968	116.9	1030.0	10.2	8.7	353.4	2.4	104.9	524.9	16.7	13.0	142.8	8.4
1967	113.7	907.2	11.1	8.0	298.8	2.6	102.9	466.6	18.1	14.0	125.6	10.1
1966	107.3	870.6	11.0	7.9	276.4	2.8	96.7	465.0	17.2	12.8	126.6	9.2
1965	93.9	856.0	9.9	6.7	277.0	2.4	84.5	443.1	16.0	11.8	119.9	8.9
1964	84.7	877.3	8.8	6.3	289.2	2.1	75.7	445.6	14.5	9.6	117.2	7.5
1963	69.4	858.7	7.5	5.9	288.1	2.0	61.4	440.0	12.3	9.8	119.6	7.5
1962	55.0	809.9	6.4	5.1	258.6	1.9	47.3	425.4	10.0	9.1	128.5	6.6

YEAR	THEFT UNDER $200			THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE			FRAUD			STOLEN GOODS		
	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC
1978	269.1	588.7	31.4	9.5	183.7	4.9	66.1	217.9	23.3	17.9	128.1	12.3
1977	236.7	567.8	29.4	9.4	191.1	4.7	58.1	203.9	22.2	15.9	123.6	11.4
1976	258.3	600.8	30.1	8.1	194.1	4.0	50.8	199.1	20.3	15.4	121.5	11.3
1975	232.7	586.5	28.4	8.3	204.3	3.9	43.0	186.7	18.7	13.3	114.3	10.4
1974	209.7	537.7	28.1	6.9	196.6	3.4	42.5	165.6	20.4	12.2	107.4	10.2
1973	190.0	525.4	26.6	6.1	170.3	3.5	38.2	168.9	18.4	10.8	103.0	9.5
1972	161.1	444.3	26.6	5.1	165.4	3.0	35.9	165.4	17.9	11.1	104.3	9.6
1971	154.3	442.6	25.9	4.8	154.8	3.0	29.7	170.2	14.9	9.3	105.0	8.2
1970	130.4	424.7	23.5	3.7	159.7	2.3	27.1	169.2	13.8	7.6	98.3	7.2
1969	102.7	380.3	21.3	3.4	161.6	2.1	22.3	152.8	12.7	6.2	88.3	6.5
1968	91.9	382.1	19.4	3.3	151.7	2.1	17.1	138.4	11.0	5.9	77.6	7.1
1967	88.9	341.0	20.7	2.8	141.8	1.9	15.6	121.7	11.4	5.2	67.0	7.2
1966	83.9	338.3	19.9	2.8	129.2	2.1	15.5	119.9	11.5	4.2	59.4	6.6
1965	72.7	323.2	18.4	2.7	135.9	1.9	13.8	113.5	10.8	4.4	57.7	7.1
1964	66.1	328.4	16.8	2.7	142.5	1.9	13.4	127.5	9.5	4.3	60.1	6.7
1963	51.7	320.4	13.9	2.0	130.7	1.5	13.3	127.2	9.5	4.0	60.4	6.1
1962	38.3	296.9	11.4	2.6	125.9	2.0	10.7	128.5	7.7	2.8	54.1	5.0

[1] The formula for computing the percent of female contribution to the total persons charged rate is:

$$\frac{\text{rate of females charged}}{\text{(rate of males charged + rate of females charged)}} \times 100$$

This was calculated for each of our selected property crimes and the property crime index.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

latter is qualified as either over or under $200, all references to "theft" mean the combined category previously mentioned. With this in mind, let us now examine the data for rates of persons charged with property crimes.

Substantial percentage changes are indicated in the Canadian female persons charged data registered in Table 4. Between 1962 and 1975 female persons charged rates for property crimes have, in most instances, increased more significantly than the comparable American data in Table 5: (1) breaking and entering (burglary) increased 341.2 **(160.5)** percent from 5.1 **(11.9)** to 22.5 **(31.0)**, (2) theft (larceny-theft) increased 416.9 **(228.7)** percent from 47.3 **(115.5)** to 244.5 **(379.6)**, (3) theft over $200 increased 28.6 percent from 9.1 to 11.7, (4) theft under $200 increased 507.6 percent from 38.3 to 232.7, (5) theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) increased 219.2 **(60.6)** percent from 2.6 **(6.6)** to 8.3 **(10.6)**, (6) fraud (fraud-embezzlement) increased 301.9 **(301.8)** percent from 10.7 **(16.7)** to 43.0 **(67.1)**, and, (7) stolen goods (property) increased 375.0 **(448.0)** percent from 2.8 **(2.5)** to 13.3 **(13.7)**. Overall, the Property Crime Index rose by 400.5 **(214.3)** percent from 55.0 **(134.0)** to 275.3 **(421.2)**. Notice that for all crimes, except stolen property, the American female arrest rates start off higher in 1962 and also end up higher in 1975 than comparable Canadian police data for persons charged.

The Canadian persons charged data reveal even greater percentage increases when we examine the entire sixteen-year period between 1962 and 1978: (1) breaking and entering increased 452.9 percent, (2) theft increased 501.5 percent, (3) theft over $200 increased 69.2 percent, (4) theft under $200 increased 602.6 percent, (5) theft-motor vehicle increased 265.4 percent, (6) fraud increased 517.8 percent, (7) stolen goods increased 539.9 percent, and, (8) the Property Crime Index increased 485.8 percent.

In addition to the female persons charged data, Table 4 also shows data for male persons charged in the selected property crime categories. These data document that percentage changes in the rates of males charged with property crimes are also significant, but not nearly as much as the massive percentage increases shown earlier in the rates of female persons charged. Comparable Canadian and American data (Tables 4 and 5) between 1962 and 1975

TABLE 5

UNITED STATES

PROPERTY CRIME ARREST RATES PER 100,000 FOR FEMALES AND MALES, AND PERCENT OF FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO TOTAL ARREST RATES*, 1960-75

	3 PROPERTY-CRIME INDEX			BURGLARY			LARCENY-THEFT			AUTO THEFT			FRAUD EMBEZZLEMENT			STOLEN PROPERTY		
YEAR	Female	Male	% Contribution	Female	Male	% Contribution	Female	Male	% Contribution	Female	Male	% Contribution	Female	Male	% Contribution	Female	Male	% Contribution
1975	421.2	1657.1	20.3	31.0	588.4	5.0	379.6	913.8	29.3	10.6	155.0	6.5	67.1	142.2	32.1	13.7	124.9	9.9
1974	428.1	1708.0	20.0	31.7	592.9	5.1	384.5	930.5	29.2	11.9	184.5	6.1	53.7	121.0	30.7	13.4	127.3	9.5
1973	339.6	1364.7	19.9	25.4	479.6	5.0	303.6	706.8	30.1	10.5	178.4	5.6	41.9	101.0	29.3	10.5	101.2	9.4
1972	327.0	1387.4	19.1	23.6	464.8	4.8	293.3	743.6	28.3	10.1	179.1	5.4	44.2	113.9	27.9	10.1	101.0	9.1
1971	321.8	1470.1	18.0	23.4	468.1	4.6	286.7	786.3	26.7	11.8	199.6	5.6	44.0	119.3	26.9	10.6	111.0	8.7
1970	298.7	1400.5	17.6	20.8	455.3	4.4	267.8	742.9	26.5	10.1	202.3	4.7	35.5	104.1	25.5	8.9	93.3	8.7
1969	252.1	1313.3	16.1	18.4	434.8	4.1	222.8	667.0	25.0	10.9	211.5	4.9	29.6	92.0	24.3	6.5	75.0	7.9
1968	213.7	1265.0	14.5	17.6	434.1	3.9	186.0	620.3	23.1	10.2	210.6	4.6	24.3	84.6	22.3	4.8	61.6	7.2
1967	200.9	1210.0	14.2	16.0	406.8	3.8	176.6	602.7	22.7	8.3	200.5	4.0	24.2	87.8	21.6	3.6	46.9	7.0
1966	183.2	1128.5	14.0	13.6	361.1	3.6	162.0	576.6	21.9	7.7	190.7	3.8	22.0	86.4	20.3	2.9	36.6	7.2
1965	176.6	1138.1	13.4	13.4	369.2	3.5	155.4	579.6	21.1	7.7	189.2	3.9	21.7	92.7	19.0	2.9	33.9	7.9
1964	156.0	1102.0	12.4	12.7	355.1	3.5	135.6	563.2	19.4	7.7	183.8	4.0	19.1	87.4	17.9	3.3	32.3	9.3
1963	134.9	1044.3	11.4	10.9	342.5	3.1	117.6	529.8	18.2	6.3	171.9	3.5	18.7	90.9	17.1	2.4	28.7	7.8
1962	134.0	1040.5	11.4	11.9	342.7	3.4	115.5	530.8	17.9	6.6	167.0	3.8	16.7	87.4	16.0	2.5	28.8	8.1
1961	112.3	1002.9	10.1	10.9	349.3	3.0	96.0	502.3	16.0	5.5	151.3	3.5	16.1	89.7	15.2	2.4	27.3	7.8
1960	101.9	961.3	9.6	9.3	324.7	2.8	87.3	487.4	15.2	5.4	149.2	3.5	14.7	87.9	14.4	2.3	26.3	8.2

*The formula for computing the % female contribution to total arrest rates is $\frac{\text{female rate}}{\text{(male + female rates)}} \times 100$.

This statistic is computed for each offense and the combined property index.

Source: Steffensmeier, Darrell J. 1978. "Crime and the Contemporary Woman: An Analysis of Changing Levels of Female Property Crime, 1960-75." *Social Forces* 57(2):566-584.
Reproduced with the written permission of the author and the University of North Carolina Press at Chapel Hill.

provide these male/female differences in percentage changes in property crime persons charged rates: (1) 113.4 **(71.7)** percent (males) versus 341.2 **(160.5)** percent (females) for breaking and entering (burglary), (2) 60.6 **(72.2)** percent (males) versus 416.9 **(228.7)** percent (females) for theft (larceny-theft), (3) -24.8 percent (males) versus 28.6 percent (females) for theft over $200, (4) 97.5 percent (males) versus 507.6 percent (females) for theft under $200, (5) 62.3 **(-7.2)** percent (males) versus 219.2 **(60.6)** percent (females) for theft-motor vehicle (auto theft), (6) 45.3 **(62.6)** percent (males) versus 301.9 **(301.8)** (females) for fraud (fraud-embezzlement), (7) 111.3 **(333.7)** percent (males) versus 375.0 **(448.0)** percent (females) for stolen goods (property), and, (8) 77.7 **(59.3)** percent (males) versus 400.5 **(214.3)** percent (females) for the Property Crime Index. The offences of theft, fraud, and stolen goods manifest persons charged rates where American males exceed Canadian males in percentage increases. Differences between the two countries' male persons charged data could again reflect differences in police charging practices.

Finally, with respect to the additional three years of Canadian persons charged data, the male figures portray slightly greater changes over the entire sixteen-year period than those changes seen above between 1962 and 1975: (1) breaking and entering increased 128.0 percent, (2) theft increased 65.1 percent, (3) theft over $200 decreased 11.4 percent, (4) theft under $200 increased 98.3 percent, (5) theft-motor vehicle increased 45.9 percent, (6) fraud increased 69.6 percent, (7) stolen goods increased 136.8 percent, and, (8) the Property Crime Index increased 82.2 percent from 809.9 to 1475.8.

Due to the difficulties of high male base rates and low female base rates in our property crime data, perhaps a much "better" measure of male and female rate changes than the percentage change used earlier is a measure of absolute change in the annual rate. This measure eliminates the distortion caused by high male, low female rates. Based on the female and male property crime data for 1962 to 1975 in Tables 4 and 5 for Canada and the United States, the absolute change in the annual property crime rates are: (1) breaking and entering (burglary) increased 1.2 **(1.4)** for females versus a 20.9 **(17.6)** rate increase for males, (2)

theft (larceny-theft) increased 14.1 **(18.9)** for females versus a 18.4 **(27.6)** increase for males, (3) theft over $200 increased 0.2 for females versus a 0.3 increase for males, (4) theft under $200 increased 13.9 for females versus a 20.7 increase for males, (5) theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) increased 0.4 **(0.3)** for females versus a 5.6 increase for Canadian males and a 0.9 rate decrease for American males, (6) fraud (fraud-embezzlement) increased 2.3 **(3.6)** for females versus a 4.2 **(3.9)** increase for males, (7) stolen goods (property) increased 0.8 **(0.8)** for females versus a 4.3 **(6.9)** rate increase for males. Overall, the combined Property Crime Index increased 15.7 **(20.5)** for females versus a 45.0 **(44.0)** rate increase for males.[24]

Looking now only at the Canadian data for the entire sixteen year period these figures are derived: (1) breaking and entering increased 1.4 (females) versus 14.5 (males), (2) theft increased 14.0 (females) versus 16.3 (males), (3) theft over $200 decreased 0.4 (females) versus a decrease of 0.9 (males), (4) theft under $200 increased 13.6 (females) versus 17.2 (males), (5) theft-motor vehicle increased 0.4 (females) versus 3.4 (males), (6) fraud increased 3.3 (females) versus 5.3 (males), (7) stolen goods increased 0.9 (females) versus 4.4 (males), and, (8) the combined Property Crime Index increased 15.7 (females) versus 39.2 (males).

B. Measurement Of The Sex Differential

Relative Differences

Percentage changes are only one indicator of female increases in property crime. The %FC figures also compare persons charged rates for females and males and assess the extent to which rates of female property crime have changed relative to male. By analyzing the percent of female contribution to the total (male plus female) rate of persons charged in each offence

---

[24]Absolute Change in the Annual Property Persons Charged Rate = $\frac{\text{1975 (female/male) rate - 1962 (female/male) rate}}{\text{Number of Years}}$

category, we can evaluate whether or not sex differences in property crime charges have diminished over our periods of study. Has the gap between female and male persons charged rates of property crime increased or decreased over the sixteen years? How do our findings compare with Steffensmeier's (1978) American data in Table 5? The Canadian data addressing these questions are also found in Table 4 and show significant increases in female participation in property crime. The relative gap in Canada, like the United States, has narrowed (1975-%FC > 1962-%FC) for each of the selected property crimes, demonstrating relative female gains in all these offences. Between 1962 and 1975 the percent of female contribution increased in all property crime categories: (1) from 1.9 **(3.4)** to 3.9 **(5.0)** for breaking and entering (burglary), (2) from 10.0 **(17.9)** to 26.4 **(29.3)** for theft (larceny-theft), (3) from 6.6 to 10.8 for theft over $200, (4) from 11.4 to 28.4 for theft under $200, (5) from 2.0 **(3.8)** to 3.9 **(6.5)** for theft-motor vehicle (auto theft), (6) from 7.7 **(16.0)** to 18.7 **(32.1)** for fraud (fraud-embezzlement), (7) from 5.0 **(8.1)** to 10.4 **(9.9)** for stolen goods (property), and, (8) from 6.4 **(11.4)** to 16.1 **(20.3)** for the Property Crime Index. The figures change only slightly when we add three years to the Canadian analysis and examine the entire period between 1962 and 1978.

In reference to the above data, we can see that the Canadian female proportion of total persons charged with each of the property crime categories has significantly increased, especially for theft, fraud, and stolen goods. Increases in the %FCs for these three property offences all exceed 5.0 percent, values deemed large by Steffensmeier (1980a). For the other property crimes presented in Table 4, the %FCs have at least doubled in all instances, with the exception of the theft over $200 category where only a 4.2 percent increase is documented. The %FC figures for fraud prove that the relative gap between males and females is progressively narrowing, although not as consistently as the upward pattern seen in the American data. The reverse is true for stolen goods (property), indicating that relative female gains are greater in the Canadian data.

The ample contribution of theft under $200 to the total property crime index rate is reflected in the %FC figures for the overall Property Crime Index. This is particularly evident given the low figures for breaking and entering and theft-motor vehicle, the other components of this index. In 1962 women comprised only a minute one-fiftieth of total persons charged with breaking and entering and theft-motor vehicle, a proportion that increased to one-twenty-sixth by 1975 and one-twentieth in 1978. Steffensmeier (1978) suggests that figures for offences such as breaking and entering (burglary) and theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) are highly unreliable given the relatively small base of females for these types of offences. He suggests that minor police reporting changes could be largely responsible for observed variations when dealing with offences that have low levels of reported cases. Thus, we can attribute only limited significance to the %FC increases realized in the categories of breaking and entering and theft-motor vehicle. He places more emphasis upon changes in his American %FC figures for larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement in Table 5. Steffensmeier (1978) found that women in 1975 comprised almost one-third of those persons arrested for larceny-theft and fraud-embezzlement whereas in 1962 women comprised less than one-sixth of persons arrested for these offences. In comparison, our data in Table 4 indicate that in 1975 Canadian women comprised approximately one-third of persons charged with theft and fraud offences while in 1962 they comprised only one-tenth and one-thirteenth, respectively, of persons charged with these same property offences.

Absolute Differences

The Absolute Gap Between The Sexes

An analysis of the data for absolute differences between the sexes in Table 6 presents contrasting conclusions to the relative differences recorded earlier with the %FC figures. Absolute differences tell us whether the absolute gap between the sexes has narrowed (female gain) or widened (female loss). These data show that the absolute gap widened in all property crime categories with the exception of theft over $200 where the absolute gap between the sexes

TABLE 6

CANADA

ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCES[1] BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RATES OF PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION FOR SELECTED PROPERTY CRIMES, 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX	BREAKING AND ENTERING	THEFT	THEFT OVER $200	THEFT UNDER $200	THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE	FRAUD	STOLEN GOODS
1978	1153.7	561.4	418.0	98.4	319.6	174.2	151.8	110.1
1977	1150.6	544.8	424.1	93.0	331.1	181.7	145.8	107.7
1976	1162.6	545.1	431.5	89.1	342.5	186.0	148.3	106.0
1975	1164.0	529.4	438.6	84.9	353.7	196.0	143.7	101.0
1974	1060.6	460.0	411.0	82.9	328.0	189.7	123.1	95.2
1973	991.4	412.2	414.9	79.6	335.4	164.2	130.8	92.3
1972	965.3	387.5	417.6	134.4	283.2	160.3	129.4	93.2
1971	991.1	391.9	449.1	160.8	288.3	150.0	140.4	95.6
1970	994.8	382.9	455.9	161.6	294.3	156.0	142.1	90.7
1969	953.2	377.8	417.1	139.6	277.6	158.2	130.5	82.1
1968	913.1	344.7	420.0	129.7	290.2	148.4	121.4	71.7
1967	793.5	290.8	363.7	111.6	252.1	139.0	106.1	61.8
1966	763.3	268.6	368.3	113.8	254.5	126.4	104.3	55.2
1965	762.2	270.3	358.6	108.2	250.4	133.2	99.7	53.3
1964	792.6	282.9	370.0	107.6	262.3	139.8	114.1	55.8
1963	789.4	282.1	378.6	109.8	268.7	128.7	113.9	56.5
1962	755.0	253.5	378.1	119.4	258.6	123.4	117.8	51.2

[1] Absolute differences between the sexes are calculated by subtracting the female rate figure from the male rate figure for each year for each of our property offences and the combined property crime index.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

narrowed from 119.4 to 84.9. The narrowing effect seen in this property crime category is no doubt partly the result of the 1972 legislative change that increased the dollar value of the theft categories from $50 to $200. The absolute differences in all other property crime persons charged rates are greater in 1975 than they were in 1962, indicating a widening in the absolute values for these offences (male gains). Hence, in absolute terms, the data in Table 6 show that Canadian females have been losing ground to males for these property crimes. The following comparisons are seen between the Canadian and American data for the years 1962 to 1975: for breaking and entering (burglary) the absolute gap widened from 253.5 **(330.8)** to 529.4 **(557.4)**, for theft (larceny-theft) from 378.1 **(415.3)** to 438.6 **(534.2)**, for theft under $200 from 258.6 to 353.7, for theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) from 123.4 **(160.4)** to 196.0 **(144.4)**, for fraud (fraud-embezzlement) from 117.8 **(70.7)** to 143.7 **(75.1)**, and for stolen goods (property) from 51.2 **(26.3)** to 101.0 **(111.2)**. For the overall Property Crime Index, the absolute gap similarly widened from 755.0 **(906.5)** in 1962 to 1164.0 **(1235.9)** in 1975. Steffensmeier's (1978) findings show that the absolute gap widened in all his American property crime categories except for auto theft and fraud-embezzlement where the change in absolute differences for the latter offences was negligible.

Looking now at the period since 1975 in the Canadian analysis, we find that the absolute gap narrowed slightly from 1975 to 1978 for theft, theft over $200, and theft-motor vehicle, but has widened in all other property crime categories in the same time frame. Over the entire sixteen years (1962 to 1978), however, the absolute gap widened in all categories with the exception again of theft over $200.

"Average" Absolute Change In The Annual Rate

Table 7 documents larger changes for males than females when we analyze absolute differences between the sexes in terms of the average absolute change in the annual rate between 1962 to 1978. Theft over $200 is the only exception in this regard registering -1.3 average absolute units of decrease in sex differences in its annual rate of change over the entire sixteen years. The latter value is higher still if we look only at the years between 1962 to 1975.

TABLE 7

CANADA

SELECTED PROPERTY CRIME ANNUAL RATES OF CHANGE[1] AND "AVERAGE" ABSOLUTE CHANGES IN DIFFERENCES IN ANNUAL RATES[2]
FOR FEMALE AND MALE PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION, 1962-1978

YEARS	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX		BREAKING AND ENTERING		THEFT		THEFT OVER $200		THEFT UNDER $200		THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE		FRAUD		STOLEN GOODS	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1977-1978	+0.133	+0.029	+0.124	+0.035	+0.139	+0.042	+0.176	+0.074	+0.137	+0.037	+0.011	-0.039	+0.138	+0.069	+0.126	+0.079
1976-1977	-0.068	-0.022	-0.016	-0.001	-0.080	+0.041	+0.008	+0.039	-0.084	-0.055	+0.160	-0.015	+0.144	+0.024	+0.032	+0.017
1975-1976	+0.108	+0.020	+0.133	+0.034	+0.110	+0.029	+0.111	+0.057	+0 110	+0.024	-0.024	-0.050	+0.181	+0.066	+0.158	+0.063
1974-1975	+0.118	+0.101	+0.154	+0.151	+0.112	+0.083	+0.147	+0.038	+0.110	+0.091	+0.203	+0.039	+0.012	+0.127	+0.090	+0.064
1973-1974	+0.109	+0.077	+0.071	+0.114	+0.112	+0.030	+0.325	+0.068	+0.104	+0.023	+0.131	+0.154	+0.113	-0.020	+0.130	+0.043
1972-1973	+0.100	+0.040	+0.319	+0.073	+0.081	+0.020	-0.647	-0.441	+0.179	+0.183	+0.196	+0.030	+0.064	+0.021	-0.027	-0.012
1971-1972	+0.036	-0.016	+0.022	-0.010	+0.036	-0.040	-0.014	-0.147	+0.044	+0.004	+0.063	+0.068	+0.209	-0.028	+0.194	-0.007
1970-1971	+0.173	+0.022	+0.107	+0.026	+0.177	+0.032	+0.128	+0.001	+0.183	+0.042	+0.297	-0.031	+0.096	+0.006	+0.224	+0.068
1969-1970	+0.256	+0.069	+0.173	+0.018	+0.267	+0.132	+0.248	+0.167	+0.270	+0.117	+0.088	-0.012	+0.215	+0.107	+0.226	+0.113
1968-1969	+0.131	+0.054	+0.195	+0.098	+0.129	+0.020	+0.208	+0.088	+0.118	-0.005	+0.030	+0.065	+0.304	+0.104	+0.051	+0.138
1967-1968	+0.028	+0.135	+0.088	+0.183	+0.019	+0.125	-0.071	+0.137	+0.034	+0.121	+0.179	+0.070	+0.096	+0.137	+0.135	+0.158
1966-1967	+0.060	+0.042	+0.013	+0.081	+0.064	+0.003	+0.094	-0.008	+0.060	+0.008	--	+0.098	+0.006	+0.015	+0.238	+0.128
1965-1966	+0.143	+0.017	+0.179	-0.002	+0.144	+0.050	+0.085	+0.056	+0.154	+0.047	+0.037	-0.049	+0.123	+0.056	-0.045	+0.030
1964-1965	+0 109	-0.024	+0.063	-0.042	+0.116	-0.006	+0.229	+0.023	+0.010	-0.016	--	-0.046	+0.030	-0.110	+0.023	-0.040
1963-1964	+0.220	+0.022	+0.068	+0.004	+0.233	+0.013	-0.020	-0.020	+0.279	+0.025	+0.350	+0.090	+0.008	+0.002	+0.075	-0.005
1962-1963	+0.262	+0.060	+0.157	+0.114	+0.298	+0.034	+0.077	-0.069	+0.350	+0.079	-0.231	+0.038	+0.243	-0.010	+0.429	+0.116
"AVERAGE" ABSOLUTE CHANGE IN THE DIFFERENCES IN ANNUAL RATE:[2]																
1962-1975	+31.5		21 3		+4.6		+2.7		+7.3		+5.6		+2.0		+3.8	
1962-1978	+24.9		+19.3		+2.5		-1.3		+3.8		+3.2		+2.1		+3.7	

[1] Annual rates of change were calculated with this formula: $\frac{\text{Year B - Year A}}{\text{Year A}}$. Using the change in the annual rate between the years 1977 and 1978 for females as an example, the computations would be: $\frac{322.2 - 284.3}{284.3} = \frac{37.9}{284.3} = +0.133$

[2] The absolute difference between the sexes in the "average" annual rate was computed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{1975 male rate - 1962 male rate}}{\text{Number of years - 1}} - \frac{\text{1975 female rate - 1962 female rate}}{\text{Number of years - 1}}$$

For comparability with Steffensmeier's (1978) figures these data were computed for the years 1962 to 1975 in addition to the data computed for the years 1962 to 1978.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

Undoubtedly, the 1972 amendment to the dollar value of the theft categories from $50 to $200 contributed to these decreasing values. Steffensmeier's (1978) data also reveal larger changes for males than females, especially for burglary. Comparatively, between 1962 and 1975, figures for Canadian and American data for the "average" absolute change in the annual rate were the following: +21.3 **(+17.4)** for breaking and entering (burglary), +4.6 **(+9.2)** for theft (larceny-theft), -2.7 for theft over $200, +7.3 for theft under $200, +5.6 **(-1.2)** for theft-motor vehicle (auto theft), +2.0 **(+0.3)** for fraud (fraud-embezzlement), +3.8 **(+6.5)** for stolen goods (property), and +31.5 **(+17.4)** for the Property Crime Index. The average absolute rates of change, although larger for most Canadian offences, indicate a replication of the American pattern of absolute change, with the exception of theft-motor vehicle. When we examine the Canadian data in Table 7 over the longer time period between 1962 and 1978, significant female gains are revealed in the values for the "average" absolute change in annual property crime persons charged rates since differences, in absolute terms, have narrowed slightly between 1975 and 1978, in favour of the female data. This is particularly evident with the offence of theft under $200 which now shows a small degree of male slippage (from +7.3 (1962 to 1975) to +3.8 (1962 to 1978)).

Relative Versus Absolute Differences

Steffensmeier (1978:573) contends it is obvious that "the interpretation of trends in female crime levels depends on the statistical procedure that is used". Although changes in relative differences are the principal concern of Steffensmeier's analyses, data in Tables 4, 6, and 7 show that absolute and relative differences do not always change in parallel fashion. Using fraud as an example (see Table 4), we see that the persons charged rate per 100,000 females was 10.7 in 1962, and among males it was 128.5 while in 1978 it was 66.1 for females and 217.9 for males. Looked at in terms of both relative and absolute differences, the relative gap has narrowed (the %FC increased from 7.7 to 23.3), but the absolute gap widened (from 117.8 in 1962 to 151.8 in 1978). Therefore, while absolute differences indicate the

overwhelmingly male nature of selected crimes, Steffensmeier (1978:573) concluded that his data also reflected the notion that "relative differences give a more accurate and less misleading picture than absolute differences of convergence in crime levels" because of dramatic differences between males and females in initial levels of persons charged (see also, Steffensmeier et al., 1979). Since female persons charged rates are considerably smaller than those of males, gains in the rate of females charged are partly a statistical artifact of low female starting points and rising rates for both sexes. This is especially true regarding the Canadian property crime categories of breaking and entering, theft-motor vehicle, fraud, and stolen goods.

C. Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged

Our third question addresses whether or not female property offenders are still largely concentrated in traditional offence categories where they have always been, primarily petty theft such as shoplifting. In other words, have there been any changes in the types of property crime for which Canadian women are charged over the years in question? An answer to this question focuses on changes within the female persons charged population.

Serious Charges

The data in Table 8 register female and male persons charged with property crimes as a percent of their respective sex cohorts charged with selected Canadian *serious* crimes. Of the female persons charged with serious crimes between 1962 and 1975, the findings are mixed and similar to Steffensmeier's (1978) findings in Table 9; that is, the percent of female persons charged increased for theft (notably theft under $200) (larceny-theft), but decreased for breaking and entering (burglary), and theft-motor vehicle (auto theft). Theft over $200 is again a notable exception indicating a percent decrease from 15.9 to 4.1 (no doubt again an artifact of the 1972 legislative change mentioned earlier). Aside from theft over $200, the percentage changes for the remaining property crime categories are: breaking and entering

TABLE 8

CANADA

FEMALES AND MALES CHARGED WITH SELECTED PROPERTY CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS CHARGED WITH SELECTED SERIOUS CRIMES[1], 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX		BREAKING AND ENTERING		THEFT		THEFT OVER $200		THEFT UNDER $200		THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1978	97.4	94.2	8.5	37.6	86.0	44.8	4.7	7.3	81.3	37.6	2.9	11.7
1977	97.0	94.0	8.6	37.3	85.2	44.1	4.5	6.9	80.8	37.2	3.2	12.5
1976	97.4	94.3	8.1	36.7	86.7	45.2	4.2	6.6	82.5	38.6	2.6	12.5
1975	97.0	94.0	7.9	36.0	86.2	44.6	4.1	6.3	82.0	38.3	2.9	13.3
1974	97.0	94.2	7.7	34.5	86.6	45.5	4.0	6.7	82.6	38.7	2.7	14.2
1973	96.8	94.5	7.9	33.5	86.2	47.7	3.4	6.8	82.8	40.9	2.7	13.3
1972	97.4	94.7	6.7	32.6	88.2	48.7	10.5	12.7	77.7	36.0	2.5	13.4
1971	97.2	94.9	6.7	32.4	88.0	50.0	11.0	14.6	77.0	35.4	2.4	12.4
1970	96.8	94.8	7.1	32.3	87.5	49.5	11.5	14.8	76.0	34.7	2.2	13.0
1969	96.6	95.0	7.6	34.0	86.5	46.9	11.5	13.6	75.1	33.3	2.5	14.1
1968	96.4	95.0	7.2	32.6	86.5	48.4	10.7	13.2	75.8	35.3	2.7	14.0
1967	97.5	95.3	6.8	31.4	88.2	49.0	12.0	13.2	76.2	35.8	2.4	14.9
1966	97.6	95.4	7.2	30.3	87.9	51.0	11.6	13.9	76.3	37.1	2.5	14.2
1965	96.7	95.7	6.9	31.0	87.0	49.5	12.1	13.4	74.9	36.1	2.7	15.2
1964	96.9	95.3	7.2	31.4	86.6	48.4	10.9	12.7	75.7	35.7	3.1	15.5
1963	96.4	95.8	8.2	32.1	85.4	49.1	13.6	13.3	71.8	35.7	2.8	14.6
1962	96.1	95.6	8.9	30.5	82.7	50.2	15.9	15.2	66.9	35.0	4.5	14.9

[1] Includes murder (capital and non-capital/first and second degree), robbery, wounding, attempted murder, breaking and entering, theft over and under $200, and theft-motor vehicle.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE 9

UNITED STATES

FEMALES AND MALES ARRESTED FOR PROPERTY CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS ARRESTED FOR SERIOUS (INDEX) CRIMES, 1960-75

	3 PROPERTY-CRIME INDEX		BURGLARY		LARCENY-THEFT		AUTO THEFT	
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
1975	89.6	78.1	6.6	27.7	80.7	43.1	2.3	7.3
1974	89.1	77.7	6.6	27.0	80.0	42.3	2.5	8.4
1973	88.4	76.4	6.6	26.8	79.0	40.0	2.7	10.0
1972	88.1	76.6	6.4	25.7	79.0	41.1	2.7	9.9
1971	88.5	78.5	6.4	25.9	78.8	42.0	3.2	10.7
1970	89.4	79.1	5.4	24.4	81.2	43.2	2.8	11.5
1969	87.8	78.9	6.4	26.1	77.6	40.1	3.8	12.7
1968	87.2	79.7	7.2	27.3	75.9	39.1	4.1	13.3
1967	86.7	79.7	6.9	26.8	76.2	39.7	3.6	13.2
1966	86.0	79.9	6.4	25.6	76.0	40.8	3.6	13.5
1965	86.3	81.2	6.6	26.3	75.9	41.4	3.8	13.5
1964	85.4	82.0	7.0	26.4	74.2	41.9	4.2	13.7
1963	84.1	81.8	6.8	26.8	73.4	41.5	3.9	13.5
1962	83.1	80.8	7.4	26.6	71.6	41.2	4.1	13.0
1961	80.9	80.4	7.8	28.0	69.1	40.3	4.0	12.1
1960	79.3	80.2	7.2	27.1	67.9	40.7	4.2	12.4

Source: Steffensmeier, Darrell J. 1978. "Crime and the Contemporary Woman: An Analysis of Changing Levels of Female Property Crime, 1960-75." *Social Forces* 57(2):566-584. Reproduced with the written permission of the author and the University of North Carolina Press at Chapel Hill.

(burglary) from 8.9 **(7.4)** to 7.9 **(6.6)**, theft (larceny-theft) from 82.7 **(71.6)** to 86.2 **(80.7)**, theft under $200 from 66.9 to 82.0, theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) from 4.5 **(4.1)** to 2.9 **(2.3)**, and the property crime index from 96.1 **(83.1)** to 97.0 **(89.6)**. There are no significant changes in the Canadian values when we add three years to the analysis, extending the time frame to 1978.

The data in Table 8 lead us to conclude that there has been little change in the percentage of Canadian women charged with these property crimes as a percent of those female persons charged with serious crimes, except for theft over $200 which dropped by 11.2 percent and theft under $200 which rose 14.4 percent. In fact, excluding the data for theft over and under $200, the changes in the Canadian data are in most instances so small as to be considered negligible.

The male data, in contrast, document slightly greater changes relative to serious crimes between 1962 and 1975 for all offences. All categories show percentage decreases except for breaking and entering and theft under $200. Steffensmeier's (1978) male data demonstrate a similar pattern of change. However, in direct contrast to the data for rates of persons charged, our Canadian data reveal that males and females have higher base figures than comparable American data. The higher Canadian figures reflect the fact that the majority of serious offences that Canadians are charged with are property-related (see Chapter III).

Both our data and Steffensmeier's (1978) lend no support to the declaration of purported increases of female involvement in serious crimes. Further, these data also establish that theft contributes the highest proportion of females charged with serious crimes; hence, any increase in serious crime charges for women is for the most part theft-related. In Canada, this increase in theft, although small, is mostly accounted for by females charged with theft under $200.

All Charges

Let us expand the analysis to examine the percent of female (and male) persons charged with property crimes now as a percent of female (and male) persons charged with *all* offences in their respective sex cohorts. These data are depicted in Table 10. Therein we find an upward pattern of percentage change in property crime index figures for females, a replication of the American experience (see Table 11). Between 1962 and 1975 the percent increase for the property crime index climbed from 12.7 **(12.1)** to 33.6 **(26.3)**, an increase reflecting the large increase in the percent of women charged with theft. The percent increase for theft (larceny-theft) changed from 11.0 **(10.4)** to 29.9 **(23.7)**. This increase in Canada is primarily due to the increased number of female persons charged with theft under $200 as a percent of all female persons charged. Small increases, although slightly greater in the Canadian data, are also noted for breaking and entering (burglary) (from 1.2 **(1.1)** to 2.8 **(1.9)**), theft-motor vehicle (auto theft) (from 0.6 **(0.6)** to 1.0 **(0.7)**), fraud (fraud-embezzlement) (from 2.5 **(1.5)** to 5.3 **(4.2)**), and stolen goods (property) (from 0.7 **(0.2)** to 1.6 **(0.9)**). We also see that it is only in the property crime categories of theft (mostly theft under $200), fraud, and stolen goods where percentage increases for females exceed those for males. Steffensmeier's (1978) findings are similar in this regard, with the exception of stolen property, where an almost negligible percentage increase of 1.0 for males was higher than the 0.7 percentage increase for females between 1962 and 1975. Extending the Canadian analysis three years to 1978 yields little change in comparison with the thirteen years analyzed above.

Steffensmeier (1978:576) suggests that the types of data in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 in many respects "provide us with a fundamental insight into existing patterns of criminality". Persons charged data for theft, particularly theft under $200, represent the greatest proportion of female persons charged with property offences in Canada, as measured by the percent contribution of females charged with theft included in the Property Crime Index. Steffensmeier (1978) concluded that a sizable increase in the percentage of females arrested for Property Crime Index offences as a percent of serious crimes could mostly be accounted for by an

TABLE 10

CANADA

FEMALES AND MALES CHARGED WITH SELECTED PROPERTY CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF ALL CHARGES[1] IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS, 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX		BREAKING AND ENTERING		THEFT		THEFT OVER $200		THEFT UNDER $200		THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE		FRAUD		STOLEN GOODS	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1978	34.5	12.9	3.0	8.3	30.5	9.8	1.7	1.6	28.8	8.2	1.0	2.6	7.1	3.1	1.9	1.8
1977	32.2	12.5	2.8	8.1	28.3	9.6	1.5	1.5	26.8	8.1	1.1	2.7	6.6	2.9	1.8	1.8
1976	35.2	13.3	2.9	8.4	31.3	10.3	1.5	1.5	29.8	8.8	0.9	2.9	5.9	2.9	1.8	1.8
1975	33.6	12.8	2.8	8.1	29.9	10.0	1.4	1.4	28.4	8.6	1.0	3.0	5.3	2.7	1.6	1.7
1974	31.7	12.0	2.5	7.2	28.3	9.5	1.3	1.4	27.0	8.1	0.9	3.0	5.5	2.5	1.6	1.6
1973	28.9	12.3	2.4	6.8	25.7	9.7	1.0	1.4	24.7	8.3	0.8	2.7	5.0	2.7	1.4	1.6
1972	30.5	13.1	2.1	6.8	27.7	10.2	3.3	2.7	24.4	7.6	0.8	2.8	5.4	2.8	1.7	1.8
1971	29.3	13.4	2.0	6.8	26.6	10.5	3.3	3.1	23.2	7.4	0.7	2.6	4.5	2.9	1.4	1.8
1970	26.6	12.8	2.0	6.5	24.0	10.0	3.1	3.0	20.9	7.0	0.6	2.6	4.3	2.8	1.2	1.6
1969	22.3	11.0	1.8	6.2	19.9	8.5	2.6	2.5	17.3	6.1	0.6	2.6	3.8	2.4	1.0	1.4
1968	20.1	10.6	1.5	5.7	18.1	8.4	2.2	2.3	15.8	6.1	0.6	2.4	2.9	2.2	1.0	1.2
1967	18.4	9.3	1.3	4.7	16.7	7.4	2.3	2.0	14.4	5.4	0.5	2.2	2.5	1.9	0.8	1.1
1966	18.0	9.6	1.3	4.5	16.2	7.6	2.2	2.1	14.1	5.5	0.5	2.1	2.6	2.0	0.7	1.0
1965	16.6	9.5	1.2	4.8	15.0	7.6	2.1	2.1	12.9	5.5	0.5	2.3	2.4	1.9	0.8	1.0
1964	16.4	10.2	1.2	5.1	14.7	7.9	1.9	2.1	12.8	5.8	0.5	2.5	2.6	2.3	0.8	1.1
1963	14.6	10.6	1.2	5.4	12.9	8.3	2.1	2.2	10.9	6.0	0.4	2.5	2.8	2.4	0.8	1.1
1962	12.7	10.9	1.2	5.1	11.0	8.4	2.1	2.5	8.9	5.9	0.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.7	1.1

[1] Includes charges under the Criminal Code, Federal Statutes (including drugs), Provincial Statutes, and Municipal By-Laws. Does not include traffic offences.

Source: See Table of Sources.

TABLE 11

UNITED STATES

FEMALES AND MALES ARRESTED FOR PROPERTY CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF ALL ARRESTS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS, 1960-75

	3 PROPERTY-CRIME INDEX		BURGLARY		LARCENY-THEFT		AUTO THEFT		FRAUD-EMBEZZLEMENT		STOLEN PROPERTY	
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males
1975	26.3	17.7	1.9	6.3	23.7	9.8	0.7	1.7	4.2	1.5	0.9	1.3
1974	25.1	17.9	1.9	6.2	22.5	9.8	0.7	1.9	3.2	1.3	0.8	1.3
1973	22.8	15.5	1.7	5.4	20.4	8.0	0.7	2.0	2.8	1.2	0.7	1.1
1972	21.3	24.9	1.5	5.0	19.1	8.0	0.7	1.9	2.9	1.2	0.7	1.1
1971	20.4	15.3	1.5	5.1	18.2	8.2	0.7	2.1	2.8	1.3	0.7	1.2
1970	21.2	14.8	1.3	4.6	19.3	8.1	0.7	2.1	2.0	0.9	0.6	1.0
1969	19.0	14.6	1.4	4.8	16.8	7.4	0.8	2.4	2.3	1.0	0.5	0.8
1968	18.0	14.6	1.5	5.0	15.6	7.2	0.9	2.4	2.1	1.0	0.4	0.7
1967	17.6	14.1	1.4	4.8	15.5	7.0	0.7	2.3	2.2	1.0	0.3	0.5
1966	17.1	13.7	1.3	4.4	15.1	7.0	0.7	2.3	2.0	1.0	0.3	0.4
1965	16.1	13.2	1.2	4.3	14.2	6.7	0.7	2.2	2.0	1.0	0.3	0.4
1964	15.4	13.6	1.3	4.4	13.3	6.9	0.8	2.3	1.9	1.1	0.3	0.4
1963	13.3	12.6	1.1	4.1	11.6	6.4	0.6	2.1	1.9	1.1	0.2	0.3
1962	12.1	11.2	1.1	3.7	10.4	5.7	0.6	1.8	1.5	0.9	0.2	0.3
1961	10.9	11.4	1.1	4.0	9.3	5.7	0.5	1.7	1.6	1.0	0.2	0.3
1960	9.9	10.7	0.9	3.6	8.5	5.4	0.5	1.7	1.4	1.0	0.2	0.3

Source: Steffensmeier, Darrell J. 1978. "Crime and the Contemporary Woman: An Analysis of Changing Levels of Female Property Crime, 1960-75." *Social Forces* 57(2):566-584.
Reproduced with the written permission of the author and the University of North Carolina Press at Chapel Hill.

an increase in the percent of arrests for larceny-theft. In Canada, theft under $200 accounted for four-fifths of female persons charged with serious crimes in 1975 compared to approximately three-fifths in 1962. Out of all crimes, theft under $200 comprised one-third of female persons charged in 1975 compared to one-tenth in 1962. Steffensmeier (1978) cites comparable figures. In relation to his findings, Steffensmeier (1978:576) concluded: "it is the large increase in females arrested for larceny-theft that provide the most convincing evidence for the argument that male and female levels of crime are converging." This conclusion regarding theft also holds true with the Canadian data.

D. Summary

The preceding data analysis of persons charged with property crimes was presented in order to evaluate (1) whether there has been an increase in rates of females charged with property-related offences in Canada, 1962-1978, (2) whether or not the gap between the sexes in levels of property crime has decreased over these same sixteen years, (3) whether within the population of females charged, changes have occurred in the proportion of women charged by police with property crimes, and (4) whether any similar data patterns, legal nomenclature aside, can be observed in the Canadian and American police data for property crime, 1962-1975.

Our analysis indicated that Canadian females are becoming more involved in property crime than they were in the early sixties. Percentage changes based on rates of females charged showed massive increases in all categories of our selected property crime analysis. Following Steffensmeier's schema, we must also determine whether these increases in females charged are greater than increases in the female population during the same period, and whether increases in females charged are equal to or greater than increases in males charged. The following major findings are derived from our property crime analysis:

1. ***Have there been increases in rates of females charged with property crime in Canada?***

   Rates of females charged with property crime have increased substantially since 1962

(intrasex comparison), with massive percentage increases occurring in each of the property crime categories studied. The rate of females charged by police with these offences increased at a faster rate than was the case with comparable male data between 1962 and 1978. The largest increase for women was the 507.6 percent rise in the rate of females charged with theft under $200.

2. *Have the gaps between male and female persons charged rates for property crime decreased?*

Comparison of male and female levels of property crime show that the relative gap, as measured by %FC figures, narrowed between 1962 and 1978. These data reveal increases in all property crime categories, especially theft under $200, fraud, and stolen goods. Yet, as Steffensmeier (1978) argues, this closing of the relative gap does not necessarily mean that females are catching up in their propensity to be charged with property crime. As originally anticipated, the absolute gap between male and female person charged rates has widened in all property crime categories, except for theft over $200. Even larger absolute differences were noted when we utilized data documenting "average" absolute changes in the annual rate. Female property crime levels in this regard continue to lag behind those of males.

3. *Within the population of persons charged, have there been increases in the proportion of females charged with selected property crimes?*

The examination of changes within the population of females charged indicated mixed findings similar to Steffensmeier (1978): among women charged with selected Canadian *serious* crimes, the percentage of females charged for theft increased (primarily theft under $200), while decreasing for breaking and entering and theft-motor vehicle. Theft over $200 showed a percentage decrease. Among the population of *all* females charged, we find a large increase in the percent of women charged with theft and theft under $200, but small increases in the percentage change with breaking and entering, theft-motor vehicle, fraud, and stolen goods.

4. *Legal nomenclature aside, are there any similar data patterns evident from the Canadian and American police data for property crime, 1962 to 1975?* When we compared our data with the American data for the years 1962 to 1975, we found that increases in the Canadian female charged rates were larger than arrest rate increases in Steffensmeier's (1978) data. This was evident because, in nearly all instances, American female arrest rates started off higher in 1962 and also ended up higher in 1975 than did comparable Canadian female charged data.

We conclude that the convergence between the sexes in levels of property crime was the greatest for theft under $200, fraud, and stolen goods. Breaking and entering and theft-motor vehicle were just as male dominated offences in 1978 as they were in 1962. In other words, the types of property crime for which Canadian women were charged show little change over the sixteen years under analysis. Police continue to charge females with "more of the same old thing", namely, petty property crimes for which women offenders have been traditionally associated: theft (mostly theft under $200) and fraud. The Canadian property crime data in this chapter demonstrate, then, that it is only partly true that women are increasingly sharing with men in illegal transgressions.

V. Males And Females Charged With Violent Crimes Against The Person

This chapter addresses sex differences in Canadian rates of persons charged with selected violent crimes between the years 1962 to 1978. The following hypothesis is tested in our data analysis:

1. We anticipate that there will be substantial increases in rates of females charged with violent crime since 1962, but that such increases will be either matched or exceeded by males. The relative gap between male and female levels of persons charged with violent crime will have increased. Similar to property crime, in absolute terms, males will again be further ahead in their propensity to be charged with violent crime.

Translated into specific questions this hypothesis speaks to the following key issues:

1. Have there been increases in rates of females charged with violent crime in Canada?
2. Have the gaps between male and female persons charged rates for violent crime decreased?
3. Within the population of females charged, have there been increases in the proportion of females charged with selected violent crimes?
4. Legal nomenclature aside, are there any similar data patterns to be found between the Canadian and American police data for violent crime, 1972-1977?

A. Violent Crime Rates of Persons Charged

Table 12 presents sex-specific rates of persons charged per 100,000 population for each of our selected violent crimes and the Violent Crime Index for the years 1962 to 1978. The analysis of these data will again focus on two time periods (1962 to 1977 and 1962 to 1978) since Steffensmeier et al. (1979) present comparable American data only up to 1977;[25] in addition, 1962 is the starting point for the Canadian data. With this notation, let us first draw a direct comparison between this study's data and the American findings of Steffensmeier et al.

---

[25]Unless otherwise noted, figures in parentheses following the Canadian data in this chapter are Steffensmeier et al.'s (1979) findings from their study of female violent crime in the United States.

TABLE 12

CANADA

SELECTED VIOLENT CRIME RATES OF FEMALE AND MALE PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION AND PERCENT OF FEMALE CONTRIBUTION TO TOTAL PERSONS CHARGED RATES (%FC)[1], 1962-1978

YEAR	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX[2]			SERIOUS VIOLENT[3]			MURDER[4]			WOUNDING[5]			ROBBERY			OTHER ASSAULTS[6]		
	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC	F	M	%FC
1978	46.9	431.5	9.8	8.7	91.0	8.7	0.7	4.9	12.5	2.7	15.2	15.3	5.2	70.8	6.9	38.2	340.1	10.1
1977	44.4	424.8	9.5	8.8	92.2	8.7	0.6	4.9	11.4	2.8	14.6	16.1	5.4	72.7	6.9	35.5	332.1	9.7
1976	42.7	417.9	9.3	8.2	88.1	8.5	0.7	4.5	13.3	2.3	14.3	13.9	5.2	69.3	6.9	34.4	329.3	9.5
1975	40.3	412.0	8.9	8.4	91.7	8.4	0.7	4.5	13.6	2.6	13.7	15.9	5.1	73.5	6.5	31.8	319.8	9.0
1974	37.9	407.1	8.5	7.5	80.9	8.5	0.6	4.4	12.6	2.5	14.5	14.5	4.4	62.1	6.7	30.2	325.7	8.5
1973	37.2	393.4	8.6	7.4	70.9	9.4	0.5	3.9	12.0	2.7	13.6	16.7	4.1	53.4	7.2	29.7	321.9	8.4
1972	30.3	371.2	7.5	5.4	65.6	7.6	0.7	3.8	14.8	2.1	13.0	13.8	2.7	48.9	5.2	24.8	305.1	7.5
1971	28.2	368.5	7.1	5.7	64.2	8.2	0.5	3.8	11.1	2.0	13.1	13.6	3.2	47.4	6.3	22.5	303.8	6.9
1970	25.5	360.6	6.6	5.5	63.9	7.9	0.4	3.3	10.4	2.0	11.8	14.3	3.1	48.9	6.0	19.9	296.3	6.3
1969	22.4	337.2	6.2	4.6	57.6	7.4	0.5	2.8	15.5	1.8	12.5	12.4	2.3	42.3	5.2	17.8	279.2	6.0
1968	21.4	326.6	6.2	4.4	53.8	7.5	0.4	2.8	11.1	1.8	10.7	14.7	2.2	40.3	5.1	17.0	272.2	5.9
1967	17.4	308.0	5.4	2.9	44.9	6.2	0.2	2.3	7.6	1.0	7.5	11.9	1.7	35.1	4.7	14.4	262.5	5.2
1966	19.4	299.3	6.1	2.6	42.0	5.9	0.3	2.3	12.9	1.1	7.2	12.7	1.2	32.5	3.7	16.6	257.1	6.1
1965	16.6	275.6	5.7	3.2	38.8	7.6	0.2	2.0	10.5	1.1	7.1	13.0	1.9	29.7	6.1	13.3	236.4	5.3
1964	14.2	264.8	5.1	2.7	42.8	5.9	0.2	2.0	10.8	1.0	7.3	12.5	1.4	33.5	4.0	11.5	221.5	4.9
1963	13.8	241.0	5.4	2.6	37.8	6.4	0.2	2.4	7.6	0.9	7.6	10.5	1.5	27.9	5.0	11.2	202.6	5.2
1962	12.3	226.5	5.2	2.3	37.5	5.7	0.2	1.9	11.4	1.0	7.6	12.0	1.0	28.1	3.4	10.0	188.4	5.1

[1] The formula for computing the percent of female contribution to the total persons charged rate is:

$$\frac{\text{rate of females charged}}{(\text{rate of males charged} + \text{rate of females charged})} \times 100$$

[2] Includes murder (capital and non-capital/first and second degree), manslaughter, wounding, attempted murder, robbery, and other assaults (not indecent).
[3] Includes murder, wounding, attempted murder, and robbery.
[4] Capital and non-capital/first and second degree murders.
[5] Includes attempted murder.
[6] Excludes indecent assaults.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

(1979) over the fifteen-year period between 1962 and 1977.

The female persons charged data contained in Table 12 show substantially greater percentage changes than those revealed in the American data in Table 13: (1) murder increased 200.0 (120.8) percent from 0.2 (2.4) to 0.6 (2.9), (2) wounding (aggravated assault) increased 180.0 (61.7) percent from 1.0 (20.1) to 2.8 (32.5), (3) robbery increased 440.0 (141.9) percent from 1.0 (4.3) to 5.4 (10.4), and, (4) other assaults increased 255.0 (57.1) percent from 10.0 (40.3) to 35.5 (63.3). For the grouped violent crime indices, persons charged rates for the Violent Crime Index increased by 261.0 (62.0) percent from 12.3 (67.6) to 44.4 (109.5), while those for Serious Violent crimes rose by 282.6 percent from 2.3 to 8.8.[24] As with the property crime data in Chapter IV, the American female arrest data start with higher bases in 1962 compared to Canadian females charged data for that same year. In fact it is higher in 1962 than the 1977 Canadian data.

We also note that the murder rate for females reached a peak figure of 0.7 three times (1972, 1975, and 1976) between 1962 and 1977. This rate has remained more or less constant since 1975 indicating a return to the consistent pattern evidenced between 1962 and 1967. The violent category of other assaults registers consistent increases, whereas the categories of wounding and robbery reveal less consistent, though generally upward, changes. When we compare all violent crime categories in Table 12, we see that the greatest area of change over the fifteen years is in the female persons charged rate for robbery.

In the United States, Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found that increases in female arrest rates for violent crime had tended to level off in the latter years of their American study and that female arrest rates had generally held steady since 1971. The Canadian data show that murder and wounding are the only violent crimes for which rates of females charged have levelled off in the same time frame, but rates for these offences have held steady only since 1973. Significant increases are also noted in the other categories of Canadian violent crime.

---

[24]Steffensmeier et al. (1979) do not cite comparable arrest rates for the Serious Violent crimes.

TABLE 13

UNITED STATES

VIOLENT CRIME ARREST RATES PER 100,000 FOR FEMALES AND MALES, AND % FEMALE CONTRIBUTION* TO TOTAL ARREST RATES FOR VIOLENT CRIME, 1960-77

	ALL VIOLENT INDEX**			MURDER			AGGRAVATED ASSAULT			ROBBERY			OTHER ASSAULTS		
	Female	Male	% Female Contrib.	Female	Male	% Female Contrib.	Female	Male	% Female Contrib.	Female	Male	% Female Contrib.	Female	Male	% Female Contrib.
1977	109.5	824.4	11.7	2.9	18.0	13.8	32.5	237.2	12.1	10.4	139.4	6.9	63.3	423.6	13.0
1976	118.3	764.9	13.4	2.9	15.6	15.8	35.2	217.5	13.8	10.9	133.1	7.6	68.9	395.6	14.8
1975	110.6	854.7	11.5	3.3	19.3	14.5	33.5	243.6	12.1	11.6	167.1	6.5	61.8	421.0	12.8
1974	106.7	884.6	10.8	3.5	21.7	13.7	35.6	246.2	12.6	12.7	186.0	6.4	64.5	427.1	13.1
1973	100.5	772.6	11.5	3.2	19.6	14.2	30.6	215.4	12.4	10.3	152.3	6.3	55.8	381.1	12.8
1972	105.2	807.8	11.5	3.4	19.8	14.6	29.9	210.6	12.4	10.3	159.2	6.1	61.2	414.1	12.9
1971	105.1	805.4	11.5	3.6	19.7	15.3	28.1	197.3	12.5	9.7	154.5	5.9	63.2	429.9	12.8
1970	94.8	762.5	11.1	3.1	18.2	14.5	24.7	184.2	11.8	8.3	137.8	5.7	58.2	417.8	12.2
1969	86.8	732.1	10.6	2.9	17.3	14.2	23.6	176.6	11.8	7.9	127.5	5.8	51.9	405.6	11.4
1968	76.5	658.3	10.4	2.7	15.4	15.1	21.7	164.9	11.6	6.4	115.3	5.2	45.1	375.7	10.7
1967	71.6	647.6	10.0	2.5	13.5	15.4	22.9	165.3	12.2	5.1	100.4	4.9	40.6	363.6	10.0
1966	67.1	595.0	10.1	2.3	12.3	15.7	22.9	160.6	12.5	4.1	84.0	4.7	37.2	333.3	10.0
1965	68.5	602.6	10.2	2.4	11.7	16.7	20.9	141.6	12.9	4.4	84.3	4.9	40.4	360.0	10.1
1964	63.1	563.2	10.1	2.1	10.2	17.0	20.2	136.0	13.0	3.9	73.1	5.0	36.4	338.9	9.7
1963	62.6	557.2	9.2	2.2	10.4	17.3	19.0	122.9	13.4	3.6	74.9	4.6	37.3	343.9	9.8
1962	67.6	576.9	10.6	2.4	10.8	18.0	20.1	128.6	13.5	4.3	83.1	4.9	40.3	349.8	10.3
1961	62.3	557.8	10.0	2.2	11.0	16.4	20.0	125.7	13.7	3.9	80.5	4.6	35.8	335.5	9.6
1960	61.3	558.7	9.9	2.2	11.1	16.8	20.3	125.7	13.9	3.5	76.5	4.4	34.7	340.2	9.3

*The formula for computing the % female contribution to the total arrest rate is $\frac{\text{female rate}}{\text{(male + female rate)}} \times 100$.

This is done for each offense and for the all violent index.

**Includes the offenses of murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, robbery, other assaults, and negligent manslaughter.

Source: Steffensmeier, Darrell J., Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier, and Alvin S. Rosenthal. 1979. "Trends in Female Violence, 1960-77." *Sociological Focus* 12(3):217-227.
Reproduced with the written permission of the senior author and Sociological Focus.

The patterns of change in the female persons charged rates for violent crime alter somewhat when we extend the analysis one year to accommodate the additional Canadian data for 1978. A few categories now yield some significant percent shifts: (1) murder now shows a percent increase of 250.0, (2) wounding 170.0 percent, (3) other assaults 282.0 percent, (4) the Violent Crime Index 281.3 percent, and, (5) Serious Violent crimes 278.3 percent. Robbery, however, now registers a percentage decrease (420.0 percent) with the extra year of data in comparison to the percentage change noted earlier between 1962 and 1977.

The rates for males charged with violent crimes show less substantial increases compared to the female data between 1962 to 1977. Since these are largely a product of the very low base rates. In direct comparison with the American male data during this fifteen year time span: (1) murder increased 157.9 **(66.7)** percent from 1.9 **(10.8)** to 4.9 **(18.0)**, (2) wounding (aggravated assault) increased 92.1 **(84.4)** percent from 7.6 **(128.6)** to 14.6 **(237.2)**, (3) robbery increased 158.7 **(67.7)** percent from 28.1 **(83.1)** to 72.7 **(139.4)**, and, (4) other assaults increased 76.3 **(21.1)** percent from 188.4 **(349.8)** to 332.1 **(423.6)**. Likewise, male persons charged rates rose for the indices of the Violent Crime Index (87.5 **(42.9)** percent from 226.5 **(576.9)** to 424.8 **(824.4)**) and for Serious Violent crimes (145.9 percent from 37.5 to 92.2).[27] Similar to the female persons charged data, we note that robbery again yields the greatest percentage change in its rate of persons charged. Further, murder is the only violent offence category where male percentage gains come even close to comparable female figures; even then, the figures are a good forty percentage points lower. Overall, we find that female percentage gains in violent crime persons charged rates outstrip all gains realized in comparable male data. In contrast, Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found parallel increases over the same time period when they compared male and female arrest rates. These conclusions for the male persons charged data also hold for the entire sixteen-year period from 1962 to 1978.

As demonstrated with the property data in Chapter IV, statistical distortion caused by high male, low female rates can be eliminated by utilizing a measure of the absolute change in

---

[27]There are again no comparable American data for these latter figures.

the annual crime rate.[21] The violent crime data for Canada and the United States found in Tables 12 and 13 show that between 1962 and 1977: (1) murder increased .03 **(.03)** for females versus a 0.2 **(0.5)** rate increase for males, (2) wounding (aggravated assault) increased 0.1 **(0.8)** for females versus a 0.4 **(6.8)** rate increase for males, (3) robbery increased 0.2 **(0.4)** for females while the male rate increased 2.8 **(3.5)**, (4) other assaults increased 1.6 **(1.4)** for females while the male rate increased 9.0 **(4.6)**. Overall, the combined Violent and Serious Violent crime indices register a 2.0 **(2.6)** increase for females versus a 12.4 **(15.5)** increase for males and a 0.4 female increase versus a 3.4 male increase, respectively. There is virtually no change in the above Canadian data when we add one more year into the analysis extending the time period to 1978.

It is easily seen that Canadian rates of persons charged with violent crime (both male and female) are considerably lower than comparable American data in every instance. The sharpest contrasts occur in the categories of other assaults and wounding (aggravated assault). Even though we have grouped Canadian violent offences in classes intended to approximate the violent offences used by Steffensmeier et al. (1979), there is one notable caveat to bear in mind when comparing police data between Canada and the United States. Namely, Giffen (1976) points out that the Canadian category of "wounding and attempted murder" does not include "assaults causing bodily harm" and "bodily harm and danger" since "assault (not indecent)" data are reported in aggregate form preventing the isolation of these two specific categories. Both of these violent crime categories would qualify as "aggravated assault" in the American statistics used by Steffensmeier et al. (1979). This difference in categorization is therefore likely to give a misleading impression of national differences. It is also plausible that American police just lay heavier charges or are more efficient in apprehending persons suspected of committing violent crimes. Nonetheless, it is fairly safe to conclude that Canadians are generally less violent in their criminal transgressions than Americans.

---

[21]Absolute Change in the Annual Violent Persons Charged Rate = $\frac{\text{1977 (female/male) rate - 1962 (female/male) rate}}{\text{Number of Years}}$

B. Measurement Of The Sex Differential

Relative Differences

Through a comparison of male and female violent crime persons charged rates, the %FC values permit us to determine the extent to which rates of female violent crime have changed between 1962 and 1978. Similar to the property crime analysis, data for the percent female contribution to the total (male plus female) rate of persons charged in each offence category allow us to evaluate whether or not sex differences between males and females have lessened over the years under analysis. Has the relative gap between the sexes narrowed or widened in each of our selected violent offences over the period under study? Table 12 yields %FC persons charged figures for Canadian violent crimes that will facilitate an answer to this question.

The %FC values for our violent offences indicate that the relative gap has narrowed (1977-%FC > 1962-%FC) by less than five percent in all categories between 1962 and 1977. Upon directly comparing these data with Steffensmeier et al.'s (1979) findings for the years 1962 to 1977 (Table 13), we draw these comparisons: (1) from 11.4 **(18.0)** to 11.4 **(13.8)** for murder, (2) from 12.0 **(13.5)** to 16.1 **(12.1)** for wounding (aggravated assault), (3) from 3.4 **(4.9)** to 6.9 **(6.9)** for robbery, (4) from 5.1 **(10.3)** to 9.7 **(13.0)** for other assaults, (5) from 5.2 **(10.6)** to 9.5 **(11.7)** for the Violent Crime Index, and, (6) from 5.7 to 8.7 for Serious Violent crimes.

As seen in the American data above, Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found the pattern of change was similar for both sexes, with the relative gap narrowing slightly for robbery and other assaults, but widening for murder and aggravated assault. These researchers also document a slight decline in the relative gap for the Violent Crime Index. The Canadian data do not replicate the American findings for murder and wounding, but otherwise conform to the general pattern of change noted by Steffensmeier et al. (1979). Interestingly, we can see a

number of similarities between these two countries' data sets in the relative values of the %FCs, even though the violent crime persons charged rates for Canada and the United States are substantially different in value. Generally speaking, however, this study's findings illustrate an overwhelming male dominance in violent crime, a conclusion also reached by Steffensmeier et al. (1979). This conclusion holds true when we extend the Canadian analysis by one year to 1978. Upon so doing, we derive a slightly more significant relative change for other assaults (5.0 percent greater), but overall the sex differentials demonstrate virtually no change in comparison to values for the time frame 1962 to 1977.

Absolute Differences

The Absolute Gap Between The Sexes

In terms of absolute differences between female and male persons charged rates, the gap between the sexes widened (female loss) in all violent crime categories, a finding also documented by Steffensmeier et al. (1979). Table 14 demonstrates this finding with the following data: for murder the absolute gap widened from 1.6 **(8.4)** to 4.3 **(15.1)**, for wounding (aggravated assault) from 6.6 **(108.5)** to 11.8 **(204.7)**, for robbery from 27.1 **(78.8)** to 67.3 **(129.0)**, and for other assaults from 178.3 **(309.5)** to 296.6 **(360.3)**. Similarly, the absolute gap widened for both the Violent Crime Index from 214.1 **(509.3)** to 380.4 **(714.9)** and for Serious Violent crimes from 35.3 to 83.4. The 1978 figures for absolute differences between male and female rates of persons charged with violent crimes also illustrate that the absolute gap between the sexes has widened even further in all instances.

"Average" Absolute Change In The Annual Rate

We also find larger changes for males than females (widening the gap) for violent crime upon examining absolute differences derived from both annual rates of change and the "average" absolute change in the annual persons charged rate. Table 15 presents these data for each of our selected violent crime categories. Between 1962 and 1977, the "average" absolute changes in the annual persons charged rates for these offences are: +0.2 **(+0.5)** for murder,

TABLE 14

CANADA

ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCES[1] BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE RATES OF PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION FOR SELECTED VIOLENT CRIMES, 1962-1978

YEAR	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX	SERIOUS VIOLENT	MURDER	WOUNDING	ROBBERY	OTHER ASSAULTS
1978	384.6	82.3	4.2	12.4	65.6	301.9
1977	380.4	83.4	4.3	11.8	67.3	296.6
1976	375.2	80.0	3.8	12.0	64.1	294.9
1975	371.7	83.3	3.8	11.1	68.4	288.0
1974	369.3	73.4	3.7	12.0	57.6	295.5
1973	356.2	63.5	3.4	10.9	49.2	292.2
1972	340.9	60.2	3.1	10.9	46.2	280.3
1971	340.3	58.5	3.3	11.0	44.2	281.4
1970	335.1	58.4	2.9	9.8	45.7	276.3
1969	314.8	53.0	2.3	10.7	40.0	261.4
1968	305.2	49.4	2.5	8.8	38.1	255.2
1967	290.6	41.9	2.1	6.5	33.3	248.1
1966	280.0	39.3	1.9	6.2	31.2	240.5
1965	259.0	35.6	1.8	6.0	27.8	223.0
1964	250.5	40.1	1.8	6.2	32.1	210.1
1963	227.2	35.3	2.2	6.7	26.4	191.3
1962	214.1	35.3	1.6	6.6	27.1	178.3

[1] Absolute differences between the sexes are calculated by subtracting the female rate figure from the male rate figure for each year for each of our property offences and the combined property crime index.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE 15

CANADA

SELECTED VIOLENT CRIME ANNUAL RATES OF CHANGE AND "AVERAGE" ABSOLUTE CHANGES IN DIFFERENCES IN ANNUAL RATES[1] FOR FEMALE AND MALE PERSONS CHARGED PER 100,000 POPULATION, 1962-1978

YEARS	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX		SERIOUS VIOLENT		MURDER		WOUNDING		ROBBERY		OTHER ASSAULTS	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1977-1978	+0.056	+0.016	-0.011	-0.013	+0.167	--	-0.036	+0.041	-0.037	-0.026	+0.076	+0.024
1976-1977	+0.040	+0.017	+0.073	+0.047	-0.143	+0.089	+0.217	+0.021	+0.038	+0.049	+0.032	+0.009
1975-1976	+0.060	+0.014	-0.024	-0.039	--	--	-0.115	+0.044	+0.020	-0.057	+0.082	+0.030
1974-1975	+0.063	+0.012	+0.120	+0.133	+0.167	+0.023	+0.040	-0.055	+0.160	+0.184	+0.053	-0.018
1973-1974	+0.019	+0.035	+0.014	+0.141	+0.200	+0.128	-0.074	+0.066	+0.073	+0.163	+0.017	+0.012
1972-1973	+0.228	+0.060	+0.370	+0.081	-0.286	+0.026	+0.286	+0.046	+0.519	+0.092	+0.198	+0.055
1971-1972	+0.074	+0.007	-0.053	+0.022	+0.400	--	+0.050	-0.008	-0.156	+0.032	+0.102	+0.004
1970-1971	+0.106	+0.022	+0.036	+0.005	+0.250	+0.152	--	+0.110	+0.032	-0.031	+0.131	+0.025
1969-1970	+0.138	+0.069	+0.196	+0.109	-0.200	+0.179	+0.111	-0.056	+0.348	+0.156	+0.118	+0.061
1968-1969	+0.047	+0.032	+0.045	+0.071	+0.250	--	--	+0.168	+0.045	+0.050	+0.047	+0.026
1967-1968	+0.230	+0.060	+0.517	+0.198	+1.000	+0.217	+0.800	+0.427	+0.294	+0.148	+0.181	+0.037
1966-1967	-0.103	+0.029	+0.115	+0.069	-0.333	--	-0.091	+0.042	+0.417	+0.080	-0.133	+0.021
1965-1966	+0.169	+0.086	-0.188	+0.082	+0.500	+0.150	--	+0.014	-0.368	+0.094	+0.248	+0.088
1964-1965	+0.169	+0.041	+0.185	-0.093	--	--	+0.100	-0.027	+0.357	-0.113	+0.157	+0.067
1963-1964	+0.029	+0.099	+0.038	+0.132	--	-0.167	+0.111	-0.039	-0.067	+0.201	+0.027	+0.093
1962-1963	+0.122	+0.064	+0.130	+0.008	--	+0.263	-0.100	--	+0.500	-0.071	+0.120	+0.075
"AVERAGE" ABSOLUTE CHANGE IN THE DIFFERENCES IN ANNUAL RATE:												
1962-1977	+11.1		+3.2		+0.2		+0.4		+2.7		+7.9	
1962-1978	+10.6		+2.9		+0.2		+0.4		+2.4		+7.7	

[1] The absolute difference between the sexes in the "average" annual rate was computed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{1977 male rate} - \text{1962 male rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1} - \frac{\text{1977 female rate} - \text{1962 female rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1}$$

For comparability with Steffensmeier et al.'s (1979) figures these data were computed for the years 1962 to 1977 in addition to the data computed for the years 1962 to 1978.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

+0.4 (+6.4) for wounding (aggravated assault), +2.7 (+3.4) for robbery, +7.9 (+3.4) for other assaults, +11.1 (+13.7) for the Violent Crime Index, and, +3.2 for Serious Violent crimes. Generally, the Canadian data for 1962 to 1977 are similar to comparable American data only for the categories of murder and robbery. The data are significantly different for wounding (aggravated assault) and other assaults. Additional Canadian data for 1978 result in slight declines in some of these absolute figures. Note, however, that changes in the absolute gap depend in part on whether persons charged rates are rising or falling for both the sexes and on dramatic differences in base rates between males and females (Steffensmeier, 1980a). Annual rates of change are also provided showing yearly gains and losses in male and female persons charged rates for these violent crimes.

Relative Versus Absolute Differences

Has the gap between male and female persons charged rates for violent crimes narrowed? While both relative and absolute differences have been reported in this study, Steffensmeier (1980a) advises us to follow the lead of researchers in related areas and focus the analysis on relative differences. In this regard, this study's findings indicate that the relative gap between males and females for violent crimes, as measured by the percent female contribution data, has changed little over the entire sixteen-year period. Even though the female data evidence substantially greater percent increases, these persons charged rates for violent offences have not kept pace with the larger and faster rising persons charged rates for males. In addition, initial levels of females charged with these violent crimes are dramatically smaller than comparable male levels; in fact, significantly more so than the sex differences documented with levels of property crime data discussed previously. Female gains in rates of persons charged with these offences are again in part a statistical artifact of low female starting points and rising rates for both the sexes. Therefore, this data analysis does not support Adler's (1975) conclusion that female levels of violent crime have been rising more quickly than male levels. Our analysis shows that female levels of violent crime have not increased relative to male

levels. Alternately, neither do this study's findings support Simon's (1975a; 1975b) conclusion that female violence is decreasing due to a lessening of feelings of frustration, powerlessness, and victimization commonly associated with traditional female role expectations.

C. Changes Within The Population Of Persons Charged

The data thus far indicate that female criminal involvement in violent offences has risen between 1962 and 1978 but is still low in comparison to males. Let us now direct our data analysis to changes within the persons charged population and address the question of changes in the types of violent crime females are charged with.

Serious Charges

Table 16 shows data for both females and male persons charged with selected violent crimes as a percent of their respective sex cohorts charged with selected *serious* crimes for the years 1962 to 1978. The data for 1962 to 1977 reveal slight percent decreases in all violent crime categories with the exception of robbery which rose a minute 0.1 percent from 1.7 to 1.8. Steffensmeier et al. (1979) found the percent of females arrested for robbery had decreased between 1960 (2.7) and 1977 (2.3) (See Table 17).[29] The Canadian data for the other violent crime categories reveal that murder decreased from 0.4 **(1.8)** to 0.2 **(0.6)** percent, wounding (aggravated assault) from 1.8 **(15.8)** to 1.0 **(7.1)** percent, and Serious Violent crimes decreased from 3.9 **(20.3)** to 3.0 **(10.1)** percent. Steffensmeier et al. (1979) concluded that a large increase in larceny arrests in their data produced the sizable reduction in the percentage of persons arrested for Serious Violent offences among female persons arrested for selected serious crimes. Additional Canadian data for 1978 substantiate the same pattern of change noted for the years 1962 to 1977, with the exception of robbery which now indicates a percentage decrease from 1.7 to 1.6.

---

[29]Since Steffensmeier et al. (1979) presented these particular data in four year intervals, starting with 1960, figures for 1962 are not available with which to make direct comparisons with the Canadian data. We are therefore forced to compare the Canadian data for 1962 with American data for 1960.

TABLE 16

CANADA

FEMALES AND MALES CHARGED WITH SELECTED VIOLENT CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS CHARGED WITH SELECTED SERIOUS CRIMES[1], 1962-1978

YEAR	SERIOUS VIOLENT		MURDER		WOUNDING		ROBBERY	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1978	2.6	5.8	0.2	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.6	4.5
1977	3.0	6.0	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.8	4.8
1976	2.6	5.7	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.6	4.5
1975	3.0	6.0	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.9	1.8	4.8
1974	3.0	5.8	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.7	4.5
1973	3.2	5.5	0.2	0.3	1.2	1.1	1.8	4.2
1972	2.6	5.3	0.3	0.3	1.0	1.1	1.3	4.0
1971	2.8	5.1	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.6	3.8
1970	3.2	5.2	0.2	0.3	1.1	1.0	1.8	4.0
1969	3.4	5.0	0.4	0.2	1.3	1.1	1.7	3.7
1968	3.6	5.0	0.3	0.3	1.5	1.0	1.8	3.7
1967	2.5	4.7	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.8	1.5	3.7
1966	2.4	4.6	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.8	1.1	3.6
1965	3.3	4.3	0.2	0.2	1.1	0.8	2.0	3.3
1964	3.1	4.7	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.8	1.6	3.6
1963	3.6	4.2	0.3	0.3	1.2	0.8	2.1	3.1
1962	3.9	4.4	0.4	0.2	1.8	0.9	1.7	3.3

[1] Includes murder, robbery, wounding, attempted murder, breaking and entering, theft over and under $200, and theft-motor vehicle.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE 17

UNITED STATES

FEMALES AND MALES ARRESTED FOR VIOLENT CRIMES AS PERCENTAGE OF SERIOUS CRIMES AND PERCENTAGE OF ALL ARRESTS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS+, 1960-77

	1960		1964		1968		1969		1973		1977	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Murder												
Serious Crimes	1.8	1.0	1.2	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.6	0.9
All Arrests	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Ag. Assault												
Serious	15.8	10.6	11.1	10.3	8.9	10.5	8.2	10.8	8.0	12.3	7.1	12.3
All Arrests	2.0	1.4	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.5
Robbery												
Serious	2.7	6.5	2.1	6.1	2.6	7.4	2.7	7.8	2.7	8.7	2.3	7.3
All Arrests	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.9	0.5	1.3	0.6	1.4	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.5
Other Assaults												
All Arrests	3.4	3.8	3.6	4.2	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.5	3.7	4.3	3.8	4.5
Serious Violent*												
Serious	20.3	18.0	14.3	16.5	12.6	18.7	11.9	19.5	15.4	22.0	10.1	20.5
All Violent**												
All Arrests	5.9	6.2	6.2	7.0	6.3	7.8	6.5	8.2	6.7	8.8	6.6	8.8

\+ For economy of space, percentages are shown in 4-year intervals as well as for the years 1968 and 1969 which mark the beginning of the women's movement.

* Includes the offenses of murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, and robbery.

** Includes the offenses of murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, robbery, other assaults, and negligent manslaughter.

Source: Steffensmeier, Darrell J., Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier, and Alvin S. Rosenthal. 1979. "Trends in Female Violence, 1960-77." *Sociological Focus* 12(3):217-227.
Reproduced with the written permission of the senior author and Sociological Focus.

In comparison to the female data, the percent of male persons charged with violent crimes as a percent of serious male charges increased, albeit to an insignificant degree, for all categories (Table 16): murder increased from 0.2 **(1.0)** to 0.3 **(0.9)**, wounding (aggravated assault) increased from 0.9 **(10.6)** to 1.0 **(12.3)**, robbery increased from 3.3 **(6.5)** to 4.8 **(7.3)**, and Serious Violent crimes increased from 4.4 **(18.0)** to 6.0 **(20.5)**. Therefore, while the pattern of change for females is one of decreases, comparable male data indicate gradual increases in the volume of male persons charged with Serious Violent crimes as a percent of selected serious crimes in their sex cohort.

All Charges

The persons charged data in Table 18 extend the above analysis by looking at the types of violent crime females and males are charged with, now as a percent of their respective sex cohorts charged with *all* charges. Compared to Canadian data in Table 16, the female data herein register percentage increases as large as or larger than comparable male increases. Upon comparison with Steffensmeier et al'.s (1979) data between the years 1962 to 1977 (Table 17), these findings for females are: (1) from 0.06 **(0.2)** to 0.07 **(0.2)** for murder, (2) from 0.2 **(2.0)** to 0.3 **(2.0)** for wounding (aggravated assault), (3) from 0.2 **(0.3)** to 0.6 **(0.6)** for robbery, (4) from 2.3 **(3.4)** to 4.0 **(3.8)** for other assaults, and, (5) from 2.9 **(5.9)** to 5.0 **(6.6)** for the Violent Crime Index. The Canadian figures are virtually the same when we extend the analysis to 1978. The persons charged pattern for males is more or less parallel to that seen in the American data. For both sexes, the category of other assaults contains the largest proportion of persons charged with violent crime as a percent of all persons charged in their respective sex cohorts. Note also that the figures for both males and females are both under 5.0 percent of their respective volume of persons charged.[30]

---

[30]Steffensmeier (1980a:1103) states that we are primarily interested in whether females have made substantial gains. He suggests calling a female gain substantial when the relative gap has narrowed to the extent that the %FC has increased five percent or more.

TABLE 18

CANADA

FEMALES AND MALES CHARGED WITH SELECTED VIOLENT CRIMES AS A PERCENT OF ALL CHARGES[1] IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SEX COHORTS, 1962-1978

YEAR	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX		MURDER		WOUNDING		ROBBERY		OTHER ASSAULTS	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
1978	5.0	6.0	0.08	0.07	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.0	4.1	4.8
1977	5.0	6.0	0.07	0.07	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.0	4.0	4.7
1976	4.9	6.2	0.08	0.07	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.0	4.0	4.8
1975	4.9	6.1	0.09	0.07	0.3	0.2	0.6	1.1	3.9	4.7
1974	4.9	6.1	0.08	0.07	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.9	3.9	4.9
1973	4.8	6.2	0.07	0.06	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.8	3.9	5.1
1972	4.6	6.3	0.10	0.06	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.8	3.8	5.2
1971	4.2	6.2	0.07	0.06	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.8	3.4	5.1
1970	4.1	5.9	0.06	0.05	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.8	3.2	4.9
1969	3.8	5.4	0.09	0.04	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.7	3.0	4.4
1968	3.7	5.2	0.06	0.05	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.6	2.9	4.4
1967	2.8	4.9	0.03	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.6	2.3	4.1
1966	3.3	4.9	0.06	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	2.8	4.2
1965	2.9	4.7	0.04	0.03	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5	2.4	4.1
1964	2.8	4.7	0.05	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.6	2.2	3.9
1963	2.9	4.5	0.04	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.5	2.4	3.8
1962	2.9	4.5	0.06	0.04	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.6	2.3	3.7

[1] Includes charges under the Criminal Code, Federal Statutes (including drugs), Provincial Statutes, and Municipal By-Laws. Does not include traffic offences.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

D. Summary

The results of this study were presented to determine (1) whether there has been an increase in the rates of females charged with violent offences in Canada, 1962-1978, (2) whether or not the gap between the sexes in rates of violent crime has decreased over these same sixteen years, (3) whether within the population of females charged, changes have occurred in the proportion of women charged by police with violent crimes, and (4) whether any similar data patterns, legal nomenclature aside, could be found between the Canadian and American police data for violent crime. The following major findings provide answers to these questions:

1. *Have there been increases in the rates of females charged with violent crime in Canada?*

   Rates of females charged with violent crime have increased since 1962 (intrasex comparison), with percentage increases documented in each of the violent crime categories under study. The greatest area of change occurred in the robbery category. Similar to our property crime analysis, these data also show that the rate of females charged by police with violent crimes increased at a faster rate between 1962 and 1978 than was the case with comparable male data. The rise in female violence also levelled off between 1973 and 1978 for murder and wounding, while the remaining categories of robbery and other assaults demonstrated consistent increases over the sixteen years.

2. *Have the gaps between male and female persons charged rates for violent crime decreased?*

   Comparison of female and male levels of violent crime showed that the relative gap, measured by the %FC data, narrowed only slightly between 1962 and 1978. This observation indicated that increases in female levels of violence have been either matched or exceeded by comparable changes in male levels of violence. This is evident despite the fact that greater percentage increases were documented with the female data. We speculated that this latter finding was in part a statistical artifact of low female starting points in the data and rising rates for both sexes. Overall, like Steffensmeier et al. (1979), the relative gap between the sexes remained about the same between 1962 and

1978, indicating that violent crime remained predominantly male dominated during this time frame (percentage changes were less than five percent in all cases except other assaults). In absolute terms, female losses were shown in all violent crime categories relative to male, the absolute gap widening the greatest in the category of other assaults.

3. *Within the population of persons charged, have there been increases in the proportion of females charged with selected violent crimes?*

Concerning changes within the female population of persons charged, our findings are similar to those of Steffensmeier et al. (1979) who used arrest data: among women charged with selected Canadian *serious* crimes, the percentage of females charged revealed slight decreases in all violent crime categories except robbery wherein the proportion of women charged increased slightly. We also suggested that the large contribution of females charged with theft (primarily petty theft under $200) in part deflated the proportions of women charged with serious crimes. Among the population of *all* females charged, the percentage of females charged with selected violent crimes rose by less than five percent in all instances, showing only a very slight movement in the direction of females becoming more violent. This same finding was also documented with the male data, leading us to conclude that with respect to Canadian violent crime, there has been little change in violent crime between 1962 and 1978.

4. *Legal nomenclature aside, are there any similar data patterns evident from the Canadian and American police data for violent crime, 1962 to 1977?*

Upon comparison with the American data between 1962 and 1977, Canadian rates for both males and females charged with violent crime were dramatically lower than comparable American data in every instance for each of the fifteen years being compared. The greatest statistical discrepancies between the two countries' data sets were registered in the categories of wounding (aggravated assault) and other assaults.

In conclusion, we find that there have been substantial increases in the rates of Canadian women involved in violent crime, but that these increases have not "skyrocketted"

over the sixteen years. Contrary to prevailing public impressions gleaned from sensationalized media reports and the arguments advocated by some academics, such as Freda Adler (1975), alleged dramatic increases in Canadian female violent crime are simply not an empirical reality. As Steffensmeier et al. (1979:224) pointedly observe, "those who conclude that female levels of violent crime have risen ignore the crucial comparison with male levels." Overall, however, we can safely state that violent crime still remains predominantly the domain of male offenders and that few, if any, inroads were realized by female offenders between 1962 and 1978 in Canada. In the next chapter, we will advance some possible explanations for this lack of change in the types of crime for which Canadian females are charged.

VI. A 'New Female Criminal' in Canada?

The parameters of a substantive concern, according to Terry (1979), tend to be established by the assessment of trends. He states that trends indicate the scope of a problem as well as the sources, direction, and consequences of change. In other words, "trends are concerned with the large-scale dimensions of a phenomenon and thus raise "big" questions and provide "big" answers" (Terry, 1979:200). In this thesis, we have provided some "big" answers to some of the "big" questions pertaining to Canadian trends in selected female crimes for the sixteen-year-period between 1962 and 1978.

The theoretical and analytical framework for this study was established by reviewing the current understanding of female crime trends. We focused upon the major dimensions of the work of three prominent researchers in the area of female criminality, all of whom utilized national police statistics in their data analyses: Freda Adler, Rita James Simon, and Darrel J. Steffensmeier. These researchers examined the veracity of the popular belief that increased female criminality has been influenced by the women's rights movement of the sixties, thus inciting women to new dimensions in crime (Crites, 1976). Accordingly, the rise in the female consciousness is reputed to be moving women closer to men in their patterns of criminal behaviour, as evidenced by large, and sometimes phenomenal, increases in the number of women dealt with by the police. Unfortunately, police statistics of this kind are marred by methodological inadequacies making it crucial that researchers view these data in their proper perspective if they wish to avoid citing rates of increase in crimes which are both alarming and misleading. This is especially true in regard to statistics for female crime.

Of the three researchers' work highlighted in this thesis, we feel that Steffensmeier's provides the most rigorous examination of differential statistics on criminality. His computations for sex-specific crime rates for different segments of the population are steps in the right direction of providing a better data base with which to come to terms with female crime trends (Terry, 1979). The present study utilizes Steffensmeier's methodology and presents national sex-specific rates of persons charged describing the extent to which Canadian

women participate in criminal activities as compared to men. Generally, the results are as predicted by the two research hypotheses posed earlier.

A. Major Findings

Our interpretation of the general pattern of Canadian persons charged data presented in Chapter III was that the majority of offences that Canadians were charged with were property-related, more specifically, theft-related. In contrast, the rate of persons charged with violent crimes against the person was significantly lower. Overall, we concluded that the property crime rates showed a faster growth rate between 1962 and 1978 than the violent crime rates.

With the above general pattern in mind, we then looked at Canadian sex-specific rates of persons charged and compared female and male rates to assess the participation of females and males in contributing to the individual rates. We also contrasted our results with the American findings of Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979) and related the findings to our study's property and violent crime hypotheses.

Three major issues were addressed in the analysis: (1) change in the female persons charged rates, (2) change in the female rates compared to the male rates - the convergence hypothesis, and, (3) a comparison of police rates between Canada and the United States for the years of data comparability.

Regarding the first issue, we demonstrated that female rates of persons charged had increased substantially over the entire sixteen years, with large percentage changes occurring particularly in the property crime categories and the violent crime category of robbery. For all property offences studied, the rate of females charged increased significantly faster than was the case with comparable male data between 1962 and 1978. This finding showed the importance of comparing female and male persons charged rates in order to view the rise in female criminality in a proper context with the corresponding male rate changes. For violent crimes, we found that the pattern of female criminality in Canada had not really changed

between 1962 and 1978, since all of the female increases were either matched or exceeded by comparable male increases. The convergence hypothesis predicting that female violent crime rates were catching up with corresponding male rates was not supported in this study. The types of crimes for which Canadian females were charged were simply "more of the same old thing" - petty property crimes such as theft (primarily shoplifting goods valued under $200) and fraud.

The increases in levels of Canadian females charged were also much larger than comparable American arrest rate increases evident from the two American studies. This was apparent because of the fact that the American arrest data started off with higher base rates in 1962 than comparable Canadian data. The most outstanding difference between the Canadian and American data sets was reflected in Canada's substantially lower violent crime rates. Legal nomenclature aside, this was particularly true in regards to rate differences between the American category of aggravated assault and the comparable Canadian offence of wounding. Overall, the results thus far confirmed our original hypotheses anticipating such increases in the rates of females charged with selected property and violent crimes relative to the male rates. But the picture of Canadian female and male criminality was not yet complete!

Our findings also showed that by using alternate measures of the sex differential - relative versus absolute - we ended up with different conclusions about the pattern of female criminality. This study used two principal methods of measuring change in the sex differential between male and female persons charged rates - relative differences and absolute differences. Following Steffensmeier's schema, we were principally concerned with changes in relative differences, but also examined absolute differences to determine the predominantly male nature of certain crimes. By using a relative measure - the percentage that the female rate contributed to the combined male and female rate for each offence (%FC) - we adjusted the sex composition of the population of persons charged and controlled for the size of the change in the sex differential. An increase of the %FC indicated a female gain relative to males; a widening represented a female loss. As predicted again by our research hypotheses, the relative

gap between the female and male persons charged rates narrowed (female gains) in all crime categories, especially theft under $200, fraud, and stolen goods. This narrowing of the relative gap occurred to a much lesser degree for the violent offences.

In absolute terms, however, a different pattern of change in the sex differential emerged. All of the offences selected for this study clearly illustrated the predominantly male nature of Canadian criminal participation. The absolute gap, as measured by the difference between the female and male persons charged rates, widened in all property and violent crime categories. We used two different computations of the absolute difference: (1) the "average" absolute change in the annual rate between the sexes, and, (2) a subtraction of the female rate from the male rate for each year of the analysis. Both computations demonstrated significant female losses in absolute terms. Increases and/or changes in the absolute gap depended partly on whether persons charged rates in specific categories rose or dropped for both the sexes and on dramatic differences in base rates between males and females. This type of statistical distortion caused by low female, high male base rates was better controlled for by using a relative measure of the sex differential. However, we can also use a measure of absolute change in the annual rate that eliminates this distortion. Furthermore, such a measure should be used in addition to other measures of change in the annual rate when discussing percentage change in the persons charged rate over the sixteen years.

Finally, upon looking at changes in the population of females charged to examine changes in the types of crimes for which men and women were charged, we found similar findings to those derived from the two American studies by Steffensmeier (1978) and Steffensmeier et al. (1979). One of the more important findings that emerged from this analysis was that the high numbers of females charged with theft (mostly theft under $200) inflated the percentage of women charged with serious crimes since theft was included in the index of selected serious crimes. Large shifts in one or a few offence categories, such as theft, reduced the percentage of total number of persons charged accounted for by other offence categories (see also, Steffensmeier and Cobb, 1981). In short, by not taking into account the high

contribution of women charged with "traditional" types of female crime, we could easily have come to misleading conclusions about changes in the types of crimes for which Canadian women are charged. For these reasons, we concluded that the types of crimes for which Canadian women are charged had not really changed between 1962 and 1978.

Steffensmeier (1980a) points out that recent sex role research explains the lack of change in female crime and suggests reasons for not expecting much change in the types of crimes that North American women are charged with. The research suggests that, despite the increased flexibility of female roles, the position of women has not demonstrated much change over time, minimizing the impact of the women's movement during the late sixties. To date, a considerable amount of research exists indicating that the traditional female roles of wife-mother and sex object still persist and are, in fact, met with high public acceptance, particularly from women (see, for example, Blake, 1974; Bryant, 1977; Chesney-Lind, 1980; Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980; de Boer, 1977; Mason et al., 1976; Parelius, 1975; and Weitz, 1977). This view concerning the primary responsibilities of North American women has remained in spite of some success by the women's movement in increasing the flexibility of roles for both the sexes (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). Research also indicates that role definitions have become more egalitarian on several dimensions (Parelius, 1975; Mason et al., 1976). Other research shows that traditional sex roles are maintained by the socialization practices of the family and school and are reinforced by the mass media (DeFrain, 1977; Fuchman et al., 1978; Lever, 1976; Rheingold and Cook, 1975; Van Gelder and Carmichael, 1975).

Unfortunately, much of the substantive evidence on changing sex roles is problematic, contradictory, and frequently plagued with conceptual ambiguity. These problems are carried over to many of the arguments intended to explain sex differences in criminal behaviour. Leading analysts such as Adler and Simon assume that sex differences in crime are due to socialization and opportunity contingencies that stem from sex role differences (Steffensmeier, 1980a). It is argued that the criminal activities of women will change in kind and degree as

women's roles change to accommodate the opportunities and strains associated with the traditional male role (Steffensmeier, 1980a).

The evidence addressing the question of whether the roles played by females in crime are indeed changing shows that it is impossible for us to conclude that "non-traditional" types of female crime have increased substantially or that females are much more involved in traditional male crimes (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). Specifically, these authors show that the largest increases in female crime are in the traditional female crime categories of larceny-theft and fraud. Our results also supported this finding. Alternately, other evidence indicates that women are playing a more active role in crime (see, Gold and Reimer, 1975; Ward et al., 1979), while still other evidence shows they are not doing so (Miller, 1973). Datesman and Scarpitti (1980:359) suggest that it is possible "that changes in female sex roles have not been extensive enough or in a direction that would lead to changes in female criminality". This type of conceptual ambiguity about gender roles can be traced in the female crime literature all the way back to Lombroso (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980; see also, Norland and Shover, 1977). There is no evidence that women who break the law are less inclined to support traditional sex roles than other women (see, Eve and Edmonds, 1978; Glick and Neto, 1977; Leventhal, 1977). Neither is there much evidence to show that the women who are committing crimes and being incarcerated support the women's movement, since the majority of women in prison are poor and members of minority groups (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980).

To the extent that the crimes of these women are linked to the traditionally male responsibility of economic support, a link between the adoption of male roles and female criminality might be posed (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). For example, many women in prison are responsible for their own support, and frequently, the support of their children. Yet, these authors also point out that this type of forced "emancipation" stems primarily from economic necessity and is similar to the situation which exists during periods of war when women assume responsibilities necessitated by the absence of men. Holter (1971) refers to this as "the crisis theory of women's equality". During periods like these the female crime rate rises

because of a demand for extra labour, not a demand for equality (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970). The effects of opportunity are not necessarily related to women's emancipation from traditional sex roles or the women's movement.

Norland and Shover (1977) also point out that there is no evidence available to demonstrate that women who commit so-called masculine crimes, as documented by Adler (1975), are themselves more masculine than those who do not commit such crimes. In addition, Carol Smart (1976:74) pointedly observes that" "if some women seem to be emulating men, it is not because of the philosophy of the Women's Movement; it is primarily because there are at present only two socially acceptable identities available to individuals, the stereotypical and polarized masculine and feminine models".

Finally, North American labour force statistics also reveal that traditional sex role stereotypes prevail in the labour force. Women are still concentrated in the "pink-collar" traditional female occupations of teaching, clerical, service, and retail sales work. This evidence challenges the argument put forth by Leventhal (1977) and Simon (1975a; 1975b) that changing patterns of female crime be explained by social-structural changes in the economic opportunities open to women in the labour force (Steffensmeier, 1980a). Labour statistics indicate that women are not making large inroads into male dominated white collar occupations as these analysts contend. Still other evidence shows that increased occupational opportunities for women accrue predominantly to the white, middle-class female population in which the "typical" female offender is not found (Crites, 1976; see also, Glick and Neto, 1977; Hovey, 1971).

The evidence based on changing sex roles to explain sex differences in criminal behaviour is contradictory and weak. If women do not occupy high status employment positions, they cannot possibly commit those crimes defined by Edwin Sutherland as white-collar crimes. Whether the term "white-collar" is used narrowly to refer to crimes committed by high socio-economic status persons in the course of their occupations (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970), or broadly to refer to crimes committed by any employee

(Akers, 1977; Walker, 1974), most female arrests for fraud and forgery are not occupationally related (Steffensmeier, 1980a). The evidence shows that most fraud arrests for women involve passing bad cheques, credit card fraud, theft of services, welfare fraud, and small con games (Giordano, 1978; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; President's Commission on Law Enforcement, 1967; Weis, 1976). Similarly, female arrests for forgery are mainly for forging credit cards, cheques, and related falsifications of identification, such as uttering. The literature shows that the typical female arrestee for employee theft or embezzlement generally occupies a low status position (for example, a lower echelon employee in a subordinate position such as a cashier, clerk, or teller who commits a theft of petty value) (Elliott, 1952; Franklin, 1979; President's Commission on Law Enforcement, 1967).

Our evidence favours the contention that the greatest proportion of the increase in the number of women arrested and charged with serious crimes can be accounted for by a disproportionately high number of theft-related offences. A variety of other studies have shown that most arrests for theft are for shoplifting goods of a petty value, usually under $200 (Cameron, 1963; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Kramer and Steffensmeier, 1977; Pollak, 1950). Including theft as a serious crime along with murder and robbery is therefore conceptually misleading since its contribution inflates those statistics related to the proportion of females involved in serious crimes, a major problem in Simon's (1975a) analysis. Alternately, the available evidence based on official police statistics does not support Adler's argument of "skyrocketting" trends in female crime, especially violent crime.

Datesman and Scarpitti (1980) believe that the bulk of the increases in female property crime for theft, fraud, and forgery cannot be explained only on the basis of expanded occupational opportunities as suggested by Simon (1975a; 1975b) (see also, Harris, 1977). It is undeniable that greater numbers of females are dealt with by the police and arrested or charged with criminal offences than in the past. An unstable national economy, a dwindling labour market, high unemployment, low wages, and alienation might be factors that influence rising female crime rates (Morris and Gelsthorpe, 1981; Weis, 1976). Self-service marketing and

credit card purchasing have also opened up new opportunities for female consumers to engage in theft, fraud, and forgery (Weis, 1976). An expanded welfare system has no doubt resulted in greater opportunities to commit welfare fraud. Increased technological developments have offered computerized record-keeping, making it easier to detect bad cheques and credit cards (Datesman and Scarpitti, 1980). More importantly, changes in store policies regarding increased aggressive action against shoplifters has undoubtedly influenced rising rates of females charged with theft.

It is undeniable that greater numbers of women are charged than ten or twenty years ago and Morris and Gelsthorpe (1981) suggest there may be good reasons why this would be so; for example, unemployment, low wages, and alienation (cited by Gavigan, 1982) Most analysts "reject any monocausal explanations for the increase" in female crime. Morris and Gelsthorpe (1981) suggest a "preliminary and speculative explanation" (cited by Gavigan, 1982:46). These authors believe an 'amplification' of recorded crime might have occurred as a result of 'hints' regarding the position of women in society that were threatening and challenging to the established social order. Specifically, these 'hints' were that the women's movement, or at least strands of the women's movement, gathered momentum during the 1960s as well as "student protests, the growth of black power, campaigns for the acceptance of homosexuality and the stridency of various youth cultures." (Morris and Gelsthorpe, 1981; cited by Gavigan, 1982:46). The "total impulse of such challenges had the effect of sensitizing opinion to the issues raised by the women's movement" (Morris and Gelsthorpe, 1981:57-58). The possibility that women might become marginal to the family was considered a serious threat to the status quo. It is therefore possible that the women's movement might have contributed to changes in the handling of females in the criminal justice system. Chesney-Lind (1980:14-15) argues that the change in the numbers "could easily be a product of a 'if it's equality they want, we'll see that they get it' attitude on the part of the law enforcement personnel". Los Angeles police captain Rudy DeLeon was quoted in *Newsweek* as saying: "In the past, police were reluctant to search women on the streets. Now they get frisked like everybody else - we can't afford to take

chances any more" (*Newsweek*, 1975). Unfortunately, Datesman and Scarpitti (1980) observe that no systematic studies have been conducted on whether perceptions such as DeLeon's are held by police, lawyers, jurors, and judges, or even influence the apprehension and adjudication of female offenders. However, there is some evidence that the preferential treatment of female offenders by the criminal justive system is diminishing (Moulds, 1978; Rasche and Foley, 1976; Steffensmeier et al., n.d.). These changes in the chivalrous handling of female offenders could be due more to changing definitions of the female sex role or a reluctance by the judiciary to base adjudications on extra-legal factors. Increases in female crime, then, might be more apparent than real when viewed in this light.

Sexual stereotypes can also be traced to attitudes held by those occupying criminal subcultures and the underworld (Steffensmeier, 1980a). Research indicates that women today are just as limited by restrictions imposed on them in the illegal marketplace as they are in the legal one (Block, 1977; Byrnes, 1886; Chambliss and King, 1972; Guerin, 1928; Jackson, 1969; Lucas, 1926; Monahan, 1941; Steffensmeier and Kokenda, 1979; Stranahan, 1977; Sutherland, 1937). Steffensmeier (1980a:1101) states that:

> "in addition to viewing women as physically weaker, more emotional, less reliable, and as not having enough daring and endurance to make it at crime, the attitude that is most identifiable in studies of professional criminals is that women are untrustworthy".

Steffensmeier (1980a) reports that the theoretical literature demonstrates that women are out of place trying to participate in many criminal activities (see also, Miller, 1975). They lack a buddy network in which they can learn the technical skills necessary to commit crimes such as breaking and entering and motor vehicle theft. The absence of an established and viable criminal subculture does not permit female criminals to make inroads into male dominated areas of criminality. Women are thus presented with only a few successful criminal role models and for this reason typically assume the role of accomplices in crimes that are masterminded and executed by males (Steffensmeier, 1980a).

B. Contributions of This Study

Explaining the sex differences in criminal participation is simply not clear cut because it is difficult to identify all the variables affecting criminality, their correlation, and the situational factors in which these variables interact. It is also not appropriate to test theories of female involvement in crime related solely to changing sex roles and come to general conclusions concerning the pattern of criminal involvement. Explanations of gender participation in crime are suspect when analysts make generalizations concerning criminality based on a restricted data base such as police statistics and labour force participation rates. The limitations of these data are generally only a short commentary in the methodologies of many studies on female criminality. Suggestions that any increases in female crime are a by-product of the women's movement and raised female consciousness irrespective of how that becomes mediated (whether by means of increased opportunities, increased occupational status, or assimilation into criminal subcultures), are destined to be invalid when generalizations are offered based primarily on these data (Terry, 1979). Many analysts of female crime trends pay only token attention to the inherent nature of the women's movement and tend to focus more on sex role theorizing to explain the changing attitudes of women. It has not yet been shown whether or not the movement has brought about any changes prerequisite to changes in female crime. Furthermore, the women's movement of the seventies is most assuredly different than the movement of the sixties. Based on the foregoing evidence, what can we say about the contribution this study makes to the present wave of academic literature on female crime?

Inspired by Steffensmeier's analyses of American arrest data, the directions taken by this research are extremely positive since new and different methods, concepts, insights, and speculations have been presented and applied to a Canadian data base. These are all useful for helping us to move towards a better understanding of the phenomenon of Canadian female crime, or for that matter, crime in general. Terry (1979:200) believes that "even those who do not care about either females or female crime should come away with something that they didn't know before and that they can apply to persons and/or behaviour that they are

interested in". We hope this study has served this purpose. Theoretically, it is also possible to furnish a variety of explanations for changes in the crime rate that range from either drastic increases or drastic decreases in the crime rate. But this was not the main focus of this study.

We have not tried to explain Canadian female crime or even attempted to predict future rates for the most part. The theoretical framework outlined earlier was only meant to place the present research in a logical context of understanding. Ours is a descriptive study of Canadian trends in selected female property and violent crimes for the sixteen years between 1962 and 1978. The crucial focus of this research is on comparisons between female and male persons charged rates, and, to a lesser degree, between Canadian and American police data. By improving the methodological adequacy of the Canadian persons charged data, this study offers the criminology discipline better evidence with which to understand female criminality in Canada. By looking at different measures of the sex differentials it is clear how many analysts have used the official police data in an inappropriate and misleading fashion. There are always advantages and disadvantages to different types of measures but it is more important that the methodology utilized gives a valid measure of the behaviour in question. This is not always easy to determine. Many who pursue an understanding of female crime trends continue to perpetuate failure mainly because they utilize the data inappropriately.

The main limitation of this study relates to the quality of the data used. *Statistics Canada Crime Statistics* prevent breakdowns of populations of persons charged and types of offences into sociologically and theoretically meaningful units, among other problems. Until the data improve, we will continue to be faced with speculation about female criminality. Yet, by demonstrating a more rigorous examination of these supposedly methodologically inadequate data, we have shown how even these data can be improved. When better data become available, the same techniques can be applied.

C. Summary

To sum up, no significant shifts are apparent in the pattern of females charged in Canada between 1962 and 1978. As in Steffensmeier's two American studies using arrest data, the trends in rates of females charged appear to be consistent with traditional sex role expectations, behaviours, and opportunities (Steffensmeier, 1979). Female crime continues to mirror the traditional role of women in North American society, despite the appearance of the women's movement in the late sixties. It is predominately small-scale, petty property and victimless offences for which Canadian female criminals, like their American sisters, are charged. Crites (1976:38) suggests that these crimes reflect "both the female status as a minor consumer and her tendency to inflict self-directed rather than outward-directed injury". Since the economic and social positions of women have changed little in the past fifteen years, it is also unlikely that the patterns of females engaged in criminality will change substantially in the foreseeable future. Today's Canadian female has not yet achieved a "liberated" position in the criminal world. The levels and types of crime with which she is associated have not really changed. Over and over again it is the same old story: females continue to be charged with property crimes of a petty nature.

Importantly, what has changed is the image of the female offender. The media and some academics have personified the image of the 'new female criminal' in the guise of personalities such as Bernadine Dohrn, Susan Saxe, Emily Harris, and a few others - members of radical political groups such as the Weather Underground and Symbionese Liberation Army. Gavigan (1982) argues that these organizations, like the FLQ, were hardly receptive to mass appeal by the female members of the public. In Canada there were only a few women members of the FLQ that were convicted and imprisoned by the authorities. Similar to Steffensmeier's studies on female crime, the invention of the 'new female criminal' in the popular conception has no more of an empirical basis in Canada than it does in the United States.

Steffensmeier (1979:48) suggests that inventions of this kind reflect "the current rhetoric, paranoia, and often times enthusiasm regarding supposed shifts and increases in

female criminality". Reactions of this kind, he believes, can be partly traced to the interests and ideologies of several social groups such as social workers and criminal justice personnel who view female crime as yet another "social problem" deserving of our time, energies, and monies" (Steffensmeier, 1979:48). Furthermore, the topic of female criminality for journalists and the mass media "is a circumspect blessing, a pressing social issue in a time of quietude, reflecting both personal and entrepreneurial interests" (Steffensmeier, 1979:48). For feminists, changes in female crime indicate shifts in traditional sex roles as well as the sexual stratification system.

In conclusion, until the aspirations, expectations, and experiences of Canadian females depart greatly from the traditional roles shaping the present pattern of female crime, these crime trends will continue in much the same way as those evidenced in this thesis. In fact, nothing short of an enormous behavioural shift would allow female and male crime rates to converge in the foreseeable future.

VII. References

Adler, Freda

1975 *Sisters In Crime - The Rise of the New Female Criminal.* Herbert M. Adler, collaborator; Hoag Lewis, interviewer. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

1977 "The Interaction Between Women's Emancipaton and Female Criminality." *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 5:101-112.

Akers, R.

1977 *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach.* Belmont: Wadsworth.

Anderson, C.M.

1967 "The Female Criminal Offender." *American Journal of Correction* 29(6):7-9.

Anderson, E.A.

1976 "The Chivalrous Treatment of the Female Offender in the Arms of the Criminal Justice System: A Review of the Litererature." *Social Problems* 23:350-357.

Anderson, Theodore and Morris Zelditch

1968 *A Basic Course in Statistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Armstrong, Gail

1982 "Females Under the Law: 'Protected' But Unequal." Pp. 61-75 In Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff (eds.;comps.), *The Criminal Justice System and Women - Offenders, Workers, Victims.* New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd..

Austin, Roy L.

1982 "Women's Liberation and Increases in Minor, Major, and Occupational Offenses." *Criminology* 20(3,4):407-430.

Avio, Kenneth L. and C. Scott Clark

1976 *Property Crime in Canada: An Econometric Study.* Ontario Economic Council Research Studies. Toronto: University Of Toronto Press.

Bartel, Ann P.

1979 "Woman And Crime - An Economic Analysis." Pp. 88-110 In Sheldon L. Messinger and Egon Bittner (eds.), *Criminology Review Yearbook* Volume 1. London: Sage Publications.

Bayer, Alan E.

1975 "Sexist Students in American Colleges: A Descriptive Note." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 37(May):391-397.

Beattie, J.M.

1975 "Criminality of Women in 18th Century England." *Journal Of Social History* 8(Summer):80-116.

Bell-Rowbottom, B. and C. Boydell
1971 "Crime in Canada: A Distributional Analysis." *Critical Issues in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.

Benson, Margaret
1968 "Special Problems Related to the Adult Female Offender." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections* 10:206-216.

1976 *Adult Female Offenders - An Examination of the Nature of Their Offences, The Criminal Process, and Service Patterns.* Initiated by the Elizabeth Fry Society of Canada. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Bertrand, Marie-Andree
1969 "Self Image and Delinquency: A Contribution to the Study of Female Criminality and Women's Image." *Acta Criminologica* (11, January):71-144.

1973 *The Insignificance of Female Criminality in the Light of Hegemonic Conceptions of Sexual Roles and the Privatization of Women*". Unpublished paper presented at the First Conference of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control, Florence.

Black, Donald
1970 "Production of Crime Rates." *American Sociological Review* 35:733-748.

Blake, J.
1974 "The Changing Status of Women in Developed Countries." *Scientific American* (September):137-147.

Blalock, Hubert M., Jr.
1972 *Social Statistics.* Second Edition. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Block, A.
1977 "Aw - Your Mother's in the Mafia: Women Criminals in Progressive New York." *Contempory Crisis* 1:5-22.

Bonacich, Edna
1972 "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonism: The Split Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 37(October):547-559.

Bowker, Lee H.
1978 *Women, Crime, and the Criminal Justice System.* Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

Braithwaite, John and Valerie Braithwaite
1980 "The Effects of Income Inequality and Social Democracy on Homicide." *British Journal of Criminology* 20(1):45-53.

Browskowski, A., R. Silverman, and H. Hinkel
1971 "Actuarial Assessment of Criminality in Women." *Criminology* 9:166-184.

Bruck, Connie
1975 "Women Against the Law." *Human Behavior* (December):25-33.

Bryant, Barbara Everitt
1977 *American Women Today and Tomorrow.* National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (March).

Byrnes, Thomas S.
1886 *Professional Criminals of America.* New York: Cassell.

Cameron, Mary Owen
1963 *The Booster and The Snitch.* New York: The Free Press.

Cernkovich, Stephen A. and Peggy C. Giordano
1979 "A Comparative Analysis of Male and Female Delinquency." *The Sociological Quarterly* 20(Winter):131-145.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman
1978 *Masculine, Feminine Or Human? An Overview of the Sociology of Gender Roles.* Second Edition. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc..

Chambliss, Bill and Harry King
1972 *Box Man: A Professional Thief's Journey.* As told to Bill Chambliss. New York: Harper & Row.

Chapman, Jane Roberts
1980 *Economic Realities and the Female Offender.* Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

Chesney-Lind, Meda
1980 "Re-Discovering Lilith: Misogyny And The New Female Criminal." Pp. 1-37 In Curt Taylor Griffiths and Margrit Nance (eds.), *The Female Offender: Selected Papers from an International Symposium.* Vancouver: Criminology Research Centre, Simon Fraser University.

Chilton, Roland and Adele Spielberger
1971 "Is Delinquency Increasing: Age Structure and the Crime Rate." *Social Forces* 49:487-493.

Clinard, Marshall B.
1942 "The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 48(September):202-213.

Clinard, Marshall B. and Daniel J. Abbot
1973 *Crime In Developing Countries - A Comparitive Perspective.* Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.

Cochrane, R.
1971 "The Structure of Value Systems in Male and Female Prisoners." *British Journal of Criminology* 11:73-79.

Cohen, Albert
1955 *The Culture of the Gang.* Glencoe: Free Press.

Cohen, L. and M. Felson
1979 "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends." *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.

Cole, K. E., G. Fisher, and S.S. Cole
1968 "Women Who Kill: A Sociopsychological Study." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 19:1-8.

Collins, R.
1971 "A Conflict Theory of Sexual Stratification." *Social Problems* 19:3-20.

Cowie, John, Valerie Cowie, and Eliot Slater
1968 *Delinquency in Girls.* London: Heinemann.

Crites, Laura
1976 "Women Offenders: Myth Vs. Reality." Pp. 33-44 In Laura Crites (ed.), *The Female Offender.* Toronto: D.C. Heath.

Dalton, K.
1961 "Menstruation and Crime." *British Medical Journal* 2:1752-1753.

Datesman, Susan K. and Frank R. Scarpitti (eds.)
1980 *Women, Crime, & Justice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Deadman, W. J.
1964 "Infanticide." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 91:558-560.

de Boer, Connie
1977 "The Polls: Women at Work." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 41(Summer):275.

DeFrain, J.
1977 "Sexism in Parenting Manuals." *The Family Coordinator* 2(6):245-251.

Deming, Richard
1977 *Women: The New Criminals.* New York: Thomas Nelson Inc..

Elliott, Mabel
1952 *Crime in Modern Society.* New York: Harper & Bros..

Ellis, D.P. and P. Austin
1971 "Menstruation and Aggressive Behaviour in a Correctional Center for Women." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 62:388-395.

Eve, Raymond A. and Kreelene R. Edmonds
1978 "Women's Liberation and Female Criminality: or "Sister, Will You Give Me Back My Dime?"." Paper presented at the National Society of Social Problems Meeting, San Francisco, California (September).

Farley, Reynolds
1977 "Trends In Racial Inequalities: Have The Gains of the 1960s Disappeared in the 1970s?" *American Sociological Review* 42(2):189-208.

Farley, Reynolds and Albert Hermalin
1972 "The 1960s: A Decade Of Progress For Blacks?" *Demography* 9(3):353-370.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser
1976 "Changes in the Socioeconomic Stratification of the Races, 1962-73." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(3):621-651.

Ferdinand, Theodore
1970 "Demographic Shifts and Criminality: An Inquiry." *British Journal of Criminology* 10:169-175.

Feinman, Clarice
1982 "Sex Role Stereotypes and Justice for Women." Pp. 131-139 In Susan K. Datesman and Frank R. Scarpitti (eds.), *Women, Crime, & Justice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Fox, John and Timothy F. Hartnagel
1979 "Changing Social Roles And Female Crime In Canada: A Time Series Analysis." *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology* 16(1):96-104.

Franklin, Alice
1979 "Criminality in the Work Place: A Comparison of Male and Female Offenders." Pp. 167-170 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.) *The Criminology of Deviant Women.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Freeman, J.
1973 "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:792-811.

Fuchman, Gaye, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and Joanne Benet (eds.)
1978 *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gavigan, Shelley
1982 "Women's Crime And Feminist Critiques: A Review Of The Literature." *Canadian Criminology Forum* 5(1):40-53.

Giffen, P.J.
1976 "Official Rates of Crime and Delinquency." Pp. 66-110 In W.T. McGrath (ed.), *Crime and Its Treatment in Canada.* Second Edition. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Giordano, P.
1978 "The Economics of Female Criminality: An Analysis of Police Blotters, 1890-1976." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. San Francisco, California (September).

Giordano, Peggy C. and Stephen A. Cernkovich
1979 "On Complicating The Relationship Between Liberation And Delinquency." *Social Problems* 26(4):467-481.

Glick, Ruth M. and Virginia V. Neto
1977 *National Study of Women's Correctional Programs.* U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (June).

Glueck, Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck
1934 *Four Hundred Delinquent Women.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gold, Martin and David J. Reimer
1975 "Changing Patterns of Delinquent Behavior Among Americans 13 Through 16 Years Old: 1967-72." *Crime and Delinquency Literature* (December):483-517.

Golodniuk, M.N.
1980 "Questions of Prevention of Crime by Women." *Soviet Law And Government* 19(2):41-53.

Gora, JoAnn Gennaro
1982 *The New Female Criminal - Empirical Reality or Social Myth?* Praeger Special Studies. New York: Praeger.

Goyer-Michaud, Francyne
1974 "The Adult Female Offender: A Selected Bibliography." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 1(4, December):340-356.

Greenwood, Victoria
1981 "The Myth of Female Crime." Pp. 73-84 In Allison Morris and Lorraine Gelsthorpe (eds.), *Women and Crime.* Cropwood Conference Series No. 13. Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.

Guerin, Eddie
1928 *Crime: The Autobiography of a Crook.* London: Murray.

Harris, Anthony
1977 "Sex and Theories of Deviance." *American Sociological Review* 42(1):3-16.

Haslam, P.
1963 "A House Can Be A Home." *Canadian Journal of Corrections* 5:86-89.

1964 "The Female Prisoner." *Canadian Journal of Corrections* 6:463-466.

1970 "The Women Offender." *Canadian Journal of Corrections* 12:301-305.

Heide, William Scott
1974 "Feminism and the 'Fallen Women'." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 1(4, December):369-373.

Heidensohn, Frances
1968 "The Deviance of Women." *British Journal of Sociology* 19(2):160-175.

Hill, Gary D. and Anthony R. Harris
1981 "Changes In The Gender Patterning Of Crime, 1953-77: Opportunity Vs. Identity." *Social Science Quarterly* 62(4):658-671.

Hindelang, Michael J.
1974 "Decisions of Shoplifting Victims to Invoke the Criminal Justice Process." *Social Problems* 21:580-593.

1979 "Sex Differences in Criminal Activity." *Social Problems* 27(2):143-156.

Hoffman-Bustamante, Dale
1973 "The Nature of Female Criminality." *Issues In Criminology* 8(2):117-136.

Holter, Harriet
1971 "Sex Roles and Social Change." *Acta Sociologica* 14:2-12.

Hovey, Marcia
1971 "The Forgotten Offenders." *Manpower Magazine* (January).

Huber, J.
1976 "Toward a Socio-Technological Theory of the Women's Movement." *Social Problems* 23:371-388.

Jackson, B.
1969 *A Thief's Primer*. New York: Free Press.

Jacobsen, A.
1975 "Crime Trends in Southern and Nonsouthern Cities: A Twenty-Year Perspective." *Social Forces* 54(September):226-247.

Jensen, G. and R. Eve
1976 "Sex Differences in Delinquency." *Criminology* 13(4):427-448.

Johnson, Elmer
1978 *Crime, Correction and Society*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey.

Jones, Ann
1980 *Women Who Kill*. New York: Holt, Rinehart And Winston.

Kessler, Evelyn S.
1976 ____ *Women: An Anthropological View*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kitsuse, John and Aaron Cicourel
1963 "A Note on the Use of Official Statistics." *Social Problems* 11:131-139.

Klein, Dorie
1976 "The Etiology of Female Crime: A Review of the Literature." Pp. 5-31 In Laura Crites (ed.), *The Female Offender*. Toronto: D.C. Heath.

Klein, Dorie and June Kress
1979 "Any Woman's Blues - A Critical Overview of Women, Crime and the Criminal Justice System." *Crime and Social Justice* 5:34-49.

Konopka, Gisela
1966 *The Adolescent Girl in Conflict*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Knudsen, D.
1969 "The Declining Status of Women: Popular Myths and the Failure of Functional Thought." *Social Forces* 48(2):183-192.

Kraditor, Aileen
1971 *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*. New York: Doubleday.

Kramer, John and Darrell Steffensmeier
1977 "Preliminary Analysis of Pennsylvania Arrest and Court Statistics, 1970-76." Unpublished manuscript.

Krohn, M.
1976 "Inequality, Unemployment and Crime." *The Sociological Quarterly* 17:303-313.

1978 "A Durkheimian Analysis of International Crime Rates." *Social Forces* 57(2):654-670.

Landau, B.
1975 "The Adolescent Female Offender - Our Dilemma." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections* 17(2):146-153.

Leventhal, Gloria
1977 "Female Criminality: Is "Women's Lib" To Blame?" *Psychogical Reports* 41:1179-1182.

Lever, J.
1976 "Sex Differences in the Games Children Play." *Social Problems* 23:479-498.

Lombroso, Caesar and William Ferrero
1959 *The Female Offender*. London: Peter Owen Limited.

Lucas, Netley
1926 *Crook Janes, A Study of the Woman Criminal the World Over*. London: Stanley Paul.

Mason, Karen Oppenheim, John L. Czaijka, and Sara Arber
1976 "Change in U.S. Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." *American Sociological Review* 41(August):573-596.

McDermott, J.
1982 "Women and Crime Prevention." *Social Policy* 13(1):48-50.

McDonald, Lynn
1969 "Crime and Punishment in Canada: A Statistical Test of the Conventional Wisdom." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 6(4):212-236.

McIntosh, Mary
1977 "Review Symposium: Women, Crime and Criminology." *British Journal of Criminology* 17:395.

Milkman, Ruth
1976 "Women's Work and Economic Crisis: Some Lessons of the Great Depression." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 8(Spring):73-79.

Miller, Eleanor M.
1983 "International Trends In The Study Of Female Criminality: An Essay Review." *Contemporary Crises* 7:59-70.

Miller, Walter
1973 "The Molls." *Society* 11(November/December):35

1975 *Violence by Youth Gangs and Youth Groups as a Crime Problem in Major American Cities.* United States Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Millman, Marcia
1975 "She Did It All For love: A Feminist View Of The Sociology Of Deviance." In Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (eds.), *Another Voice.* Garden City, N.J.: Anchor.

Monahan, Florence
1941 *Women in Crime.* New York: Washburn.

Morris, Allison and Lorraine Gelsthorpe (eds.)
1981 *Women and Crime.* Cropwood Conference Series No. 13. Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.

Morris, Monica B.
1973 "The Public Definition of a Social Movement." *Sociology and Social Research* 57(July):526-533.

Moulds, Elizabeth F.
1978 "Chivalry and Paternalism: Disparities of Treatment in the Criminal Justice System." *Western Political Quarterly* XXXI(September):429.

Mukherjee, Satyanshu K. and R. William Fitzgerald
1981 "The Myth of Rising Female Crime." Pp. 127-166 In Satyanshu K. Mukherjee and Jocelynne A. Scutt (eds.), *Women and Crime.* Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Mulvihill, Donald J. and Melvin M. Tumin
1969 *Crimes of Violence.* Volume II. A Staff Report submitted to the National Committee on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nettler, Gwynn
1974 *Explaining Crime.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Newsweek Magazine
1975 "The Woman's Touch." *Newsweek* (January 6):35.

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent
1975 *SPSS - Statistical Package For The Social Sciences.* Second Edition. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Nielson, Joyce
1978 *Sex in Society: Perspectives on Stratification.* Belmont: Wodsworth Publishing Company.

Niemi, Beth and Cynthia Lloyd
1975 "Sex Differentials in Earnings and Unemployment Rates." *Feminist Studies* 2:195-200.

Noblit, George W. and Janie M. Burcart
1976 "Women and Crime: 1960-1970." *Social Science Quarterly* 56(March):650-657.

Norland, Stephen and Neal Shover
1977 "Gender Roles and Female Criminality - Some Critical Comments." *Criminology* 15(1):87-104.

Normandeau, Andre
1970 "Canadian Criminal Statistics - Not Again!" *The Canadian Journal of Corrections* 12:198-206.

Parelius, Ann P.
1975 "Emerging Sex-Role Attitudes, Expectations, and Strains Among College Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 37(February):146-153.

Pollak, Otto
1950 *The Criminality Of Women.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Price, Barbara Raffel and Natalie J. Sokoloff (eds.;comps.)
1982 *The Criminal Justice System and Women - Women Offenders, Victims, Workers.* New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd..

Price, R.D.
1977 "The Forgotten Female Offender." *Crime and Delinquency* 23(2):101-107.

Prins, Herschel
1980 *Offenders, Deviants or Patients?* London: Tavistock.

Quinn, N.
1977 "Anthropological Studies of Women's Status." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6:181-225.

Radzinowicz, Leon and Joan King
1977 *The Growth of Crime - The International Experience.* Markham, Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd..

Rans, Laurel L.
1978 "Women's Crime: Much Ado About...?" *Federal Probation Quarterly - A Journal Of Correctional Philosophy And Practice* XXXXII(1):45-49.

Rasche, Christine
1974 "The Female Offender as An Object of Criminological Research." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 1(4):301-320.

Rasche, Christine E. and Linda A. Foley
1976 "A Longitudinal Study of Sentencing Patterns for Female Offenders." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Tucson, Arizona (November).

Reckless, Walter C.
1957 "Female Criminality." *Crime and Delinquency* 3(1, January):1-6.

1961 *The Crime Problem.* New York: Century-Crofts.

1973 *Criminal Behavior.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reckless, Walter and Barbara Kay
1967 *The Female Offender.* Report to the President's Committee on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Rheingold, H.L. and K.V. Cook
1975 "The Content of Boys' and Girls' Rooms as an Index of Parents' Behavior." *Child Development* 46:459-463.

Ridley, Jeanne C.
1968 "Demographic Change and the Roles and Status of Women." *Annals* 375(January):15-25.

Roberts, Steven
1971 "Crime Rate of Women Up Sharply Over Men's." *New York Times* (June 13):1-3.

Rollack, Tracy L.
1979 *Theoretical Perspectives On Female Criminality.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Edmonton, Alberta: Department of Sociology, University of Alberta (Fall).

Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist
1974 "Women, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview." Pp. 17-42 In Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture, and Society.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rosenblatt, Ellen and Cyril Greenland
1974 "Female Crimes of Violence." *Canadian Journal Of Criminology And Corrections* 16(April):173-180.

Rosenthal, Alvin S. and Darrell J. Steffensmeier
1978 *A Method For Convertng UCR Arrest Statistics Into Refined Arrest Rates.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (April 1).

Rossi, P., E. Waite, Christine Bose, and R. Berk
1974 "The Seriousness of Crimes: Normative Structure and Individual Differences." *American Sociological Review* 39:224-237.

Sacks, Karen
1974 "Engels Revisited: Women, the Organization of Production, and Private Property." Pp. 207-222 In Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture, and Society.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Salhany, R.
1972 *Canadian Criminal Procedure.* Second Edition. Toronto: Canada Law Book Ltd..

Sanday, Peggy R.
1974 "Female Status in the Public Domain." Pp. 189-206 In Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Women, Culture, and Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Scutt, J.A.
1979 "Myth of the Chivalry Factor in Female Crime." *Australian Journal Of Social Issues* 14(1):3-20.

Shover, Neal and Stephen Norland
1978 "Sex Roles and Criminality: Science or Conventional Wisdom?" *Sex Roles* 4(1):111-125.

Silverman, Robert A. and James J. Teevan Jr.
1975 *Crime In Canadian Society*. Toronto: Butterworth and Co. (Canada) Ltd..

Simon, Rita James
1975a *Women And Crime*. Toronto: Lexington Books.

1975b *The Contemporary Woman And Crime*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1976 "American Women and Crime." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 423:31-46.

1979a "A Look to the Future." Pp. 6-9 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.), *The Criminology Of Deviant Women*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

1979b "Arrest Statistics." Pp. 101-113 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.), *The Criminology Of Deviant Women*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

Simon, Rita James and Freda Adler (eds.)
1979 *The Criminology Of Deviant Women*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Simon, Rita James and Navin Sharma
1979 "Women and Crime: Does the American Experience Generalize?" Pp. 391-400 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.), *The Criminology Of Deviant Women*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Smart, Carol
1976 *Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd..

Smith, Douglas A. and Christy A. Visher
1980 "Sex And Involvement In Deviance/Crime: A Quantitative Review Of The Empirical Literature." *American Sociological Review* 45(August):691-701.

Sokoloff, Natalie J. and Barbara Raffel Price
1982 "The Criminal Law and Women." Pp. 9-33 In Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff (eds.;comps.), *The Criminal Justice System and Women - Offenders, Workers, Victims*. New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd..

Stang Dahl, Tove and Annika Snare
1978 "The Coercion of Privacy: A Feminist Perspective." Pp. 8-26 In Carol Smart and Barry Smart (eds.), *Women, Sexuality and Social Control.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J.
1978 "Crime and the Contemporary Woman: An Analysis of Changing Levels of Female Property Crime, 1960-75." *Social Forces* 57(December):566-584.

1979 "Trends In Female Crime: It's Still A Man's World." *USA Today* (September):44-48.

1980a "Sex Differences in Patterns of Adult Crime, 1965-77: A Review and Assessment." *Social Forces* 58(June):1080-1108.

1980b "Assessing the Impact of the Women's Movement on Sex-Based Differences in the Handling of Adult Criminal Defendants." *Crime & Delinquency* (July):344-357.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Robert E. Clark
1980 "Sociocultural Vs. Biological/Sexist Explanations Of Sex Differences In Crime: A Survey Of American Criminology Textbooks." *The American Sociologist* 15(November):246-255.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Michael J. Cobb
1981 "Sex Differences In Urban Arrest Patterns, 1934-79." *Social Problems* 29(1):37-50.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Charlene Jordan
1978 "Changing Patterns of Female Crime in Rural America, 1962-75." *Rural Sociology* 43(1):87-102.

Steffensmeier, Darrel and J. Kokenda
1979 "The Views of Contemporary Thieves Concerning Patterns of Female Criminality." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

Steffensmeier, Darrel, John H. Kramer, and Cynthia Kempinen
n.d. "Erosion of Chilvary? Changes in the Handling of Male and Female Defendants from 1970 to 1975." Unpublished paper.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J., Alvin S. Rosenthal, and Constance Shehan
1980 "World War II And Its Effect On The Sex Differential In Arrests: An Empirical Test Of The Sex-Role Equality And Crime Proposition." *The Sociological Quarterly* 21(Summer):403-416.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier
1980 "Trends In Female Delinquency." *Criminology* 18(1):62-85.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J., Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier, and Alvin S. Rosenthal
1979 "Trends in Female Violence, 1960-1977." *Sociological Focus* 12(3):217-227.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Robert M. Terry
1973 "Deviance and Respectability: An Observational Study of Reactions to Shoplifting." *Social Forces* 51:417-426.

Stewart, A. and D. Winter
1977 "The Nature and Causes of Female Suppression." *Signs* 2(3):531-553.

Stranahan, Susan
1977 "My Father, Angelo Bruno." *Today: The Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine* (August 21):10-14,20,22,28.

Sutherland, Edwin
1937 *The Professional Thief.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sutherland, E.H. and D.R. Cressey
1970 *Criminology.* New York: J.P. Lippincott.

Suval, Elizabeth M. and Robert C. Brisson
1974 "Neither Beauty nor Beast: Female Criminal Homicide Offenders." *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 2(1, February):23-34.

Terry, Robert M.
1979 "Trends in Female Crime: A Comparison of Adler, Simon and Steffensmeier." *California Sociologist* 2(2):200-212.

Thomas, W.I.
1967 *The Unadjusted Girl.* New York: Harper & Row.

Van Gelder, L. and C. Carmichael
1975 "But What About Our Sons?" *Ms.* (October):52-56, 94-95.

Walker, Andrew
1974 "Sociology and Professional Crime." Pp. 87-113 In Abraham S. Blumberg (ed.), *Current Perspectives on Criminal Behavior – Essays on Criminology.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Walshaw, A.
1971 "Women and Crime as a Social Problem." *Social Deviance in Canada.* Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing Co..

Ward, David A., Maurice Jackson, and Renee E. Ward
1979 "Crimes Of Violence By Women." Pp. 114-138 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.), *The Criminology Of Deviant Women.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Weis, Joseph G.
1976 "Liberation and Crime: The Invention of the New Female Criminal." *Crime and Social Justice* 6:17-27.

Weitz, Shirley
1977 *Sex Roles: Biological, Psychological, and Social Foundations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wellford, Charles F.
1973 "Age Composition and the Increase in Recorded Crime." *Criminology* 11(May):61-70.

Wheeler, Stanton
1967 "Criminal Statistics: A Reformulation of the Problem." *The Journal Of Criminal Law, Criminology And Police Science* 58(3):317-324.

Wilson, James O.
1968 *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, Nancy Koser
1981 *Prostitution, Theft And Occupational Choice In Crime.* Unpublished paper. Southern Illinois University: Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections.

Wilson, Nancy Koser and Constance M. Rigsby
1975 "Is Crime A Man's World? Issues In The Exploration Of Criminality." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 3:131-140.

Wolfgang, Marvin E.
1963 "Uniform Crime Reports: A Critical Appraisal." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 3:708-738.

1979 "Race and Sex Differences." Pp. 139-149 In Rita James Simon and Freda Adler (eds.), *The Criminology Of Deviant Women.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Woodward, Kenneth L. and Phyllis Malamud
1975 "Now, The Violent Woman." *Newsweek* (October 6):29.

Zay, Nicholas
1963 "Gaps in Available Statistics in Crime and Delinquency in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 29(1):75-89.

Government Publications

Canadian Committee on Corrections
1969 *Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections. Towards Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections. (The Ouimet Report).* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Canadian Corrections Association
1969 *Brief on the Woman Offender.* Canadian Corrections Association.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics
1962-71 *Crime Statistics (Police).* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence
n.d. *Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.* Volume II. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

1967 *Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Royal Commission on the Status of Women

1969 *Criminal Law and Women Offenders.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada

1938 *Report of the Royal Commission on the Penal System: The Archambault Report.* Ottawa: King's Printer.

Solicitor General Canada

1977a *Report Of The National Advisory Committee On The Female Offender.* Ottawa: Public Affairs Division of the Canadian Penitentiary Service and the National Parole Service.

1977b *The Female Offender - Selected Statistics.* Report On The National Advisory Committee Of The Female Offender. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

1978 *The Female Offender: A Statistical Perspective.* Susan Gillis Adams, consultant. Ottawa: Information Systems and Statistics Divison (March).

Statistics Canada

1972-81 *Crime and Traffic Enforcement Statistics.* Ottawa: Information Canada. Catalogue #85-205.

1973b *Population 1921-1971. Revised Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age Group, Canada And The Provinces.* Ottawa: Information Canada (July). Catalogue #91-512 (Occasional).

1975b "Comparison Of Crime Index Offence Rates, Canada And The United States, 1973." *Service Bulletin: Law Enforcement, Judicial And Correctional Statistics.* 3(1,May). Catalogue #85-001.

1979 *Revised Annual Estimates Of Population By Sex And Age For Canada And The Province, 1971-1976.* Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada (March). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

1981b *The Future Of National Justice Statistics And Information In Canada.* Report of the National Project on Resource Coordination for Justice Statistics and Information. Volume 1. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

1981c *Towards the Establishment of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.* Report on the Implementation Work Group on Justice Statistics. Volume 2. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services (April).

1983 *Intercensal Annual Estimates Of Population, By Sex And Age For Canada And The Provinces, 1976-1981.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada (September). Catalogue #91-518 (Occasional).

Appendix

Glossary Of Offences, Terms, And Formulae

Note: There has been some modification of legal nomenclature. Numbers in parentheses following offence descriptions represent criminal code classifications for 1978, the last year under analysis in our study. Details of the general U.C.R. rules for reporting (scoring) and the definitions developed for offences and terminology suppled to the police for completing the crime statistics form (Form "C") are published in the Uniform Crime Reporting Manual by Statistics Canada.

Absolute Change in the Annual Property Persons Charged Rate, Canada: This measure is calculated with the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{1975 (female/male) rate - 1962 (female/male) rate}}{\text{Number of Years}}$$

For the Absolute Change in the Annual Violent Persons Charged Rate, the year 1977 was used to subtract the 1962 rates.

Adult, Canada: Any person sixteen years or over, or such other age as may be directed in any province.**United States:** Any person eighteen years or over, or such other age as may be directed in any state.

Aggravated Assault, United States: An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe bodily injury. This type of assault is accompanied by the use of a weapon or other means likely to produce death or great bodily harm (e.g. shooting, cutting, stabbing, maiming, poisoning, scalding, or by the use of acids, explosives, or other means). Excludes simple assaults.

All Charges, Canada: Includes murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, sexual offences (including rape), assaults (not indecent), robbery, breaking and entering, theft of motor vehicle, theft over $200, theft $200 and under, have stolen goods, frauds, prostitution, gaming and betting, offensive weapons, arson, bail violations, counterfeit currency, disturb the peace, escape custody, indecent acts, kidnapping, public morals, obstruct public peace officer, prisoner unlawfully at large, trespass at night, wilful damage (public and private)(includes mischief), other Criminal Code offences, offences under the Narcotic Control Act as well as Controlled and Restricted drugs under the Food and Drug Act, other Federal Statutes (except traffic), Provincial Statutes (except traffic), and Municipal By-Laws (except traffic). See individual offence categories for greater detail.

All Offences, United States: Includes both Parts I and II offences of the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme. Crime Index offences are included among the Part I offences. **Part I offences:** criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary - breaking or entering, larceny-theft (except motor vehicle theft), motor vehicle theft. **Part II offences:** other assaults (simple), arson, forgery and counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property (buying, receiving, possessing), vandalism, weapons (carrying, possessing, etc.), prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offences (except forcible rape, prostitution, and

commercialized vice), drug abuse violations, gambling, offences against the family and children, driving under the influence, liquor laws, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, all other offences (except traffic), suspicion, curfew and loitering laws, and runaways.

All Violent Crime Index, United States: Includes murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, robbery, other assaults, and negligent manslaughter.

Annual Rate of Change, Canada: Annual rates of change were calculated with the following formula: $\frac{\text{Year B - Year A}}{\text{Year A}}$

Arrest, Canada: "The restraint of an individual by a peace officer or by someone acting for a peace officer. The statement of a peace officer that an individual is under arrest, accompanied by a touching of that individual constitutes a legal arrest. In considering whether the public interest may be served by arrest or not, the peace officer must consider all circumstances including the need to: (a) to establish the identity of a person,
(b) to secure or preserve evidence of or relating to the offence, or
(c) to prevent the continuation or repetition of the offence or the commission of another offence" (Salhany, 1972:25).
An arrest may be made with or without a warrant.

Assault, Canada: A person commits an assault when, (a) without the consent of another person, he applies force intentionally to that other person, directly or indirectly; (b) he attempts or threatens, by an act or gesture, to apply force to another person, if he has, or causes that other person to believe upon reasonable grounds that he has, present ability to effect his purpose; or (c) while openly wearing or carrying a weapon or an imitation thereof, he accosts or impedes another person or begs. This applies to all forms of assault, including sexual assault, sexual assault with a weapon, threats to a third party, or causing bodily harm and aggravated sexual assault (S. 244 C.C.). Includes: Common Assault (S. 245(1) C.C.); Assault with Intent (S. 246(1) C.C.); To Resist Arrest (S. 246(2)(b) C.C.); and To Rescue Goods Seized (S. 246(2)(c) C.C.).

Attempted Murder, Canada: Everyone who attempts by any means to commit murder (S. 222 C.C.). **United States:** Attempt to murder or assault to murder are reported as Aggravated Assault.

Attempted Offences, Canada: Everyone who, having an intent to commit an offence, does or omits to do anything for the purpose of carrying out his intention is guilty of an attempt to commit the offence whether or not it was possible under the circumstances to commit the offence. **United States:** Attempt to murder or assault to murder are reported as Aggravated Assault. Attempt to commit robbery, aggravated assault, burglary - breaking or entering, and auto theft. All attempted offences are counted with offences.

Auto Theft, United States: Effective January 1, 1974 Auto Theft was changed to Motor Vehicle Theft in the revised edition of the Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook. Denotes the unlawful taking (e.g. "joyriding") or stealing of a motor vehicle, including attempts. A motor vehicle is self-propelled and travels on the surface rather than on rails. Specifically excluded from this category are motorboats, construction equipment, airplanes, and farming equipment.

"Average" Absolute Change in the Differences in the Annual Rate, Canada: Steffensmeier (1978) refers to this as the "Average Annual Rate of Change". The Canadian version of this statistic is computed as follows:

$$\frac{1975 \text{ male rate} - 1962 \text{ male rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1} - \frac{1975 \text{ female rate} - 1962 \text{ female rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1}$$

For comparability with Steffensmeier's (1978) figures for property crime, these data were computed for the years 1962 to 1975 in addition to the data computed for 1962 to 1978. For violent crime, the analysis involved the years 1962 to 1977 for comparability with the American data as well as the period from 1962 to 1978 with the extra year of Canadian data. Steffensmeier believes sex differences in absolute terms can be determined by calculating annual rates of change. **Average Annual Rate of Change, United States:** The difference between males and females in the average rate of change is computed as follows:

$$\text{Difference between sexes in average annual rate} = \frac{1975 \text{ male rate} - 1960 \text{ male rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1} - \frac{1975 \text{ female rate} - 1960 \text{ female rate}}{\text{Number of years} - 1}$$

See ""Average" Absolute Change in the Differences in the Annual Rate, Canada".

Breaking and Entering, Canada: Everyone who (a) breaks and enters a place with intent to commit an indictable offence therein, (b) breaks and enters a place and commits an indictable offence therein, or (c) breaks out of a place after (i) committing an indictable offence therein, or (ii) entering the place with intent to commit an indictable offence therein, is guilty of an indictable offence. Excludes cases of breaking into a motor vehicle, as these are classified as thefts. Includes business premises, offices, warehouses, residences, trains, box-cars, and "piggy-backs" (S. 306,307 C.C.).

Burglary, United States: Housebreaking or any breaking or unlawful entry of a structure with the intent to commit a felony or a theft. Includes attempted forcible entry.

Crime Index Offences, United States: The Crime Index Offences are all of the Part I offences with the exception of 1(b) Manslaughter by negligence.

Drug Federal Statutes, Canada: Includes addicting opiate-like drugs and cannabis (marijuana, hashish) under the Narcotic Control Act, Controlled drugs included in Schedule "G" of the Food and Drug Act (e.g. amphetamine and its salts), and Restricted drugs included in Schedule "H" of the Food and Drug Act (e.g. LSD, MDA).

Embezzlement, United States: Misappropriation or misapplication of money or property entrusted to one's care, custody, or control. Up until 1964, fraud and embezzlement offences were grouped together in the Uniform Crime Reporting program.

Fraud, Canada: False pretences (S. 320,323 C.C.), forgery, uttering, fraud and all offences as defined in the Criminal Code: criminal breach of trust (S. 296 C.C.), theft of credit card (S. 301.1 C.C.), false telegrams (S. 329,330 C.C.), threatening letters and telephone calls (S. 331 C.C.), counterfeiting revenue stamps (S. 334 C.C.), destroying or falsifying documents (S. 335,336 C.C.), frauds (S. 338-348 C.C.), fraud on creditors (S. 350 C.C.), fraud in relation to fares (S. 351 C.C.), mining frauds (S. 352-354 C.C.), falsification of books and documents (S. 355-360 C.C.), personation with intent (S. 361-363 C.C.), trade mark forgery and frauds (S. 355-360 C.C.), etc.. Includes frauds classified and scored as cheque or credit card frauds. **United States:** Fraudulent conversion and obtaining of money or property by false pretences. Includes larceny by bailee as well as bad cheques (except forgeries and counterfeiting).

Homicide, Canada: A person commits homicide when:
(1) Directly or indirectly, by any means, he causes the death of a human being.
(2) Homicide is culpable or not culpable.
(3) Homicide that is not culpable is not an offence.
(4) Culpable homicide is murder or manslaughter or infanticide.
(5) A person commits culpable homicide when he causes the death of a human being, (a) by means of an unlawful act; (b) by criminal negligence; (c) by causing that human being, by threats or fear of violence or by deception, to do anything that causes his death; or (d) by wilfully frightening that human being, in the case of a child or sick person (S. 205 C.C.).

Indictable Offence, Canada: See "Summary and Indictable Offences".

Indictment, Canada: An indictment "...is a written accusation of crime against one or more persons which has been preferred by the Crown and presented upon oath by a grand jury in those provinces where grand juries still exist" (Salhany, 1972:102-103). Indictments may contain multiple counts of offences.

Information, Canada: "An information is a written complaint upon oath by someone (usually a police officer) stating that he has personal knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that a person (whether named or unknown) has committed an indictable offence" (Salhany, 1972:102). "Anyone who upon reasonable and probable grounds believes that an offence punishable on summary conviction has been committed may lay an information. The information must be in writing and sworn under oath by the informant" (Salhany, 1972:180).

Juvenile, Canada: Any girl or boy under the age of sixteen years, or such other age as may be directed in any province. **United States:** Any girl or boy under the age of eighteen years, or such other age as may be directed in any state.

Larceny-Theft, United States: The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Thefts of bicycles, automobile accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or any stealing of property or article which is not taken by force and violence or by fraud. Excludes embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, worthless cheques, etc. and motor vehicle theft.

Manslaughter, Canada: Manslaughter is culpable homicide that is not murder, infanticide, or causing death by criminal negligence (S. 217 C.C.).

Manslaughter by Negligence, United States: Any death which the police investigation established was primarily attributable to gross negligence of some individual other than the victim.

Municipal By-Laws, Canada: Includes offences under all Municipal By-Laws (except traffic).

Murder, Canada: From 1962 to 1976 murder was classified as either capital murder or non-capital murder. Murder was capital murder, in respect of any person, where such person by his own act caused or assisted in causing the death of: (a) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace acting in the course of his duties, or (b) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, goaler, guard or other officer or permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties, or counselled or procured another person to do any act causing or assisting in causing the death. All other murder other than capital murder was non-capital murder.

In 1976, the Criminal Code was amended; capital punishment was abolished and replaced with a mandatory life sentence for all those offences for which death penalties existed. Murder was reclassified from capital and non-capital murder to first and second degree murder. Four forms of homicide now constitute first degree murder: planned and deliberate murder, murder of a peace officer in the line of duty, murder committed in the course of certain criminal acts, and murder committed by a person that has previously been convicted of first or second degree murder. All other murder is second degree murder (S. 214 C.C.). In 1974 the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme began categorizing infanticide (S. 216 C.C.) as a separate offence category, but up until that time it was included in the murder categories.

Murder and Non-Negligent Manslaughter, United States: All willful felonious homicides as distinguished from deaths caused by negligence, and excludes attempts to kill, assaults to kill, suicides, accidental deaths, or justifiable homicides. Justifiable homicides are limited to: (1) the killing of a felon by a law enforcement officer in the line of duty; and (2) the killing of a person in the act of committing a felony by a private citizen.

Non-Serious (Petty) Crimes, Canada: See "Petty Property Crimes, Canada".

Other Assaults, Canada: Includes assault - causing bodily harm (S. 228-232,245 C.C.), assault - peace officer (S. 246 2(a) C.C.), assault - other public peace officer (S. 246 2(a)(c) C.C.), common assault (S. 245(1) C.C.), assault with intent (S. 246(1) C.C.), to resist arrest (S. 246 2(b) C.C.), and to rescue goods seized (S. 246 2(c) C.C.). Excludes indecent assaults. **United States:** Assaults which are not of an aggravated nature and where no weapon is used (simple assaults).

Other Federal Statutes, Canada: Includes offences under the Bankruptcy Act, Canada Shipping Act, Customs Act, Excise Act, Juvenile Delinquents Act (for contributing offences only), and other Federal Statutes. Excludes traffic offences.

Percent of Female Contribution to the Total Rate of Persons Charged (%FC), Canada: This calculation gives us the relative proportion of male and female incidents of persons charged with selected offences. It is computed as follows:

$$\%FC = \frac{\text{rate of females charged}}{\text{(rate of males charged + rate of females charged)}} \times 100$$

This was calculated for each of our selected property and violent crimes as well as the combined indices for both property and violent crimes. These figures represent a ratio of the rates of persons charged and assume an equal proportion of males and females in the base population upon which the rates are derived. **United States:** Since Steffensmeier used arrest data in his computations, he defines this term as the percent that females contribute to the total (male + female) arrest rate for (1) each offence, and, (2) the combined property and violent crime indices. He maintains that these percentages enable comparison of male and female arrest rates.

Persons Arrested, United States: The number of arrests are primarily a measure of police activitiy. Arrest practices, policies, and enforcement emphases vary within and among communities. The volume of police arrests for certain types of unlawful conduct, such as drunkenness, disorderly conduct, and some local ordinances, is particularly influenced by the above. On the other hand, arrests for robbery, burglary, and other serious crimes are more likely the result of standard procedures. The number of arrests also provides a useful indicator of criminal involvement of perpetrators by age, sex, and race, particularly for those crimes which have a high-solution rate. Procedures used in the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme require that an arrest be counted on each separate occasion a person is taken into custody since one person may be arrested several times during the year. For example, as noted above, recurrent arrests tend to be higher for offences against public order, such as drunkenness, vagrancy, and disorderly conduct violations. Excludes traffic violations.

Persons Charged, Canada: The number of persons, not charges, are being counted. A person simultaneously charged with more than one type of offence is scored only once and against the most serious offence in the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme.

A person is counted as charged when an Information (Form 2, Criminal Code) is laid against an individual whose identity has been established. This includes arrests, summonses to appear, appearance notices, and warrants to apprehend.

Persons arrested by other police forces are not counted as they will be counted by the force concerned. Individuals under this heading are broken down into adults and juveniles and further subdivided by gender.

Petty Property Crimes, Canada: Includes theft over and under $200 and fraud. **United States:** Includes larceny-theft, fraud, forgery, and embezzlement.

Population, Canada: Rates of persons charged are based on June 1st census and intercensal population estimates of the Canadian population age 10 years and over for each year 1962 to 1978 inclusive. Preliminary intercensal population estimates are later revised in census years (1966, 1971, 1976, and 1981) using data for interprovincial migration from the files of Revenue Canada and data for emigration from the family allowance files. The totals for immigrants, births, and deaths are thus updated using the latest available data. Closure errors were recalculated for the years 1971-1976 and 1977-1978 and assigned using a linear distribution.

Property Crime Index, Canada: Includes breaking and entering, theft over and under $200, and theft-motor vehicle. **United States:** Includes burglary, larceny-theft, and auto theft.

Provincial Statutes, Canada: Includes offences under all Provincial Statutes (except traffic): Liquor Acts, all offences relating to liquor laws including licensing, etc., Securities Act, and other Provincial Statutes not specified.

Robbery, Canada: Force or threat of force is a necessary ingredient in robbery whereas stealing from the person may be, and usually is, done secretly. Robbery includes stealing with violence, threats of violence, and while armed (S. 302,304 C.C.). Note that the act of a pickpocket or snatching property from the person is not in itself robbery. In that case, there must be an injury done or a struggle for possession. **United States:** Stealing or taking anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person by force or by violence or by putting in fear, such as strong-arm robbery, stickups, armed robbery, and attempts or assaults to rob.

Selected Serious Crimes, Canada: Includes murder, robbery, wounding, attempted murder, breaking and entering, theft over and under $200, and theft-motor vehicle. **United States:** Serious (Type I) crimes are murder, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, and auto theft.

Serious Violent Crimes, Canada: Includes murder, wounding, attempted murder, and robbery. **United States:** Includes murder/non-negligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, and robbery.

Statistics Canada, Canada: Refers to the government agency responsible for compiling statistics for the Federal government. Included in their compilation are crime and corrections statistics. This agency was formerly known as the *Dominion Bureau of Statistics (DBS)*.

Stolen Goods, Canada:
(1) Everyone who has anything in his possession knowing that it was obtained either by the commission in Canada of an offence punishable by indictment, or by an act or ommission anywhere that, if it had occurred in Canada, would have constituted an offence punishable by indictment.
(2) In proceedings under subsection (1), evidence that a person has in his possession a motor vehicle the serial number of which has been wholly or partially obliterated is, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, proof that such person has the motor vehicle in his possession knowing that it was obtained by either means outlined in (a) or (b) of subsection (1) above. This category includes unlawfully having mail in posession, having in possession stolen goods brought into Canada, and bringing stolen property into Canada (S. 312,313 C.C.). Includes: Unlawfulling having mail in possession (S. 314(1)(b) C.C.); Having in possession stolen goods brought into Canada (S. 315 C.C.); and Bringing stolen property into Canada (S. 315 C.C.).

Stolen Property, United States: Buying, receiving, and possessing stolen property (including attempts).

Summary and Indictable Offences, Canada: "A criminal offence is classified either as summary or indictable. Some offences, such as impaired driving or common assault, may be summary or indictable at the option of the prosecutor (offences such as the possession of heroin, hashish or marijuana). On such offences the prosecutor will normally opt to proceed summarily on a first offence or mild instance. He will attempt to proceed by indictment on a second offence or an aggravated first offence. There are some offences on which the prosecutor must proceed summarily on a first offence and on which he has an option for a second offence (e.g. failure to attend court).
The simplest distinction between summary and indictable offences is that summary offences are less serious than indictable offences as indicated by their respective maximum penalties. The maximum penalty for the most minor indictable crime (such as shoplifting or theft $200 and under or common assault by indictment) is two years imprisonment. This two-year maximum also applies to indictable offences such as impaired driving, hit-and-run, possession of a prohibited weapon, etc.. Most serious indictable offences bear maximum jail terms of 5, 7, 10, 14 years or life imprisonment" (Silverman and Teevan, 1975:378-379).

Theft, Canada:
(1) Every one commits theft who fraudulently and without colour of right takes, or fraudulently and without colour of right converts to his use or to the use of another person, anything whether animate or inanimate, with intent, (a) to deprive, temporarily or absolutely, the owner of it or a person who has a special property or interest in it, of the thing or of his property or interest in it, (b) to pledge or deposit it as security, (c) to part with it under a condition with respect to its return that the person who parts with it may be unable to perform, or (d) to deal with it in such a manner that it cannot be restored in the condition in which it was at the time it was taken or converted.
(2) A person commits theft when, with intent to steal anything, he moves it or causes it to move or be moved, or begins to cause it to become movable.
(3) A taking or conversion of anything may be fraudulent notwithstanding that it is effected without secrecy or attempt at concealment.
(4) For the purposes of this Act the question whether anything that is converted is taken for the purpose of conversion, or whether it is at the time it is converted, in the unlawful possession of the person who converts it is not material.
(5) For the purposes of this section a person who has a wild living creature in captivity shall be deemed to have a special property or interest in it while it is in captivity and after it has escaped

from captivity (S. 283 C.C.).

Theft-Motor Vehicle, Canada: A motor vehicle is a vehicle which is propelled or driven otherwise than by muscular power but does not include a vehicle which operates on rails. Includes mopeds and motorized snow vehicles such as ski-doos, snowmobiles, etc.. Cases where a motor vehicle is taken without the owner's consent (e.g. "joyriding") are also included in this category (S. 295 C.C.). Note that registration is not a criterion for determining whether a particular vehicle is a motor vehicle or not. In 1974 the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme began categorizing "Automobiles" separately under the general heading "Theft of Motor Vehicle".

Theft Over $200, Canada: Includes cases of theft and attempted theft over $200: bicycles, from motor vehicles (including parts and contents), shoplifting, theft by person required to account, misappropriation of money, and theft of telecommunication services (S. 290,292,294(a) C.C.). Between 1962 and 1972 theft was designated as either over or under $50. The Criminal Code was amended in 1972 and the dollar cutoff for the value of the stolen goods was raised to $200, in part, to account for inflation.

Theft Under $200, Canada: Includes cases of thefts and attempted thefts where the alleged value does not exceed $200 (S. 287(1)(2),290,292,294(b) C.C.). See also categories and notes for "Theft Over $200".

Uniform Crime Reporting, Canada: The Uniform Crime Reporting Programme collects uniform statistics from accredited Canadian police forces, on the nature and extent of reported or known offences against all levels of legislation in Canada in order to provide a measurement of the magnitude and frequency of reported offences. It is a census survey collecting data on a monthly basis on 132 offence classifications and 7 variables on most of these classifications. The programme surveys the police administration, crime and traffic enforcement aspects of municipal police forces in centres with a population of 750 and over, that employ full-time police personnel, federal, provincial, railway, and National Harbours Board police forces. The data on the number of reported or known offences are processed by law enforcement services and the clearance of these offences in order to measure and to describe the degree of law enforcement in relation to the legislation. **United States:** Uniform Crime Reporting is a local, county, and State law enforcement programme. This programme provides a nationwide view of crime based on the voluntary submission of police statistics by law enforcement agencies throughout the country. The crime data are submitted either to a State Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) programme or directly to the national UCR programme which is administered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.).

Violent Crime Index, Canada: Includes murder (capital and non-capital/first and second degree), manslaughter, wounding, attempted murder, robbery, and other assaults (not indecent). **United States:** See "All Violent Crime Index, United States".

Wounding, Canada: Everyone who with intent (a) to wound, maim or disfigure any person, (b) to endanger the life of any person, or (c) to prevent the arrest or detention of any person, discharges a firearm, air gun, or air pistol at or causes bodily harm in any way to any person, whether or not that person is the one mentioned in paragraph (a), (b) or (c), is guilty of an indictable offence (S. 228(a)(b)(c)). Until 1974, all persons charged with "Assault causing bodily harm" (S. 228-232,245 C.C.) were also included in the "Wounding" category in the Uniform Crime Reporting Programme.

TABLE A1

POPULATION AGE 10 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX, CANADA, JUNE 1ST 1962-1978

YEAR	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
1978	19,930,400	9,849,100	10,081,400
1977	19,675,200	9,733,500	9,941,700
1976	19,372,800	9,594,200	9,778,600
1975	19,030,400	9,435,400	9,595,000
1974	18,628,500	9,245,600	9,382,900
1973	18,206,100	9,045,400	9,160,700
1972	17,843,300	8,875,000	8,968,400
1971	17,498,100	8,713,400	8,784,700
1970	17,129,000	8,536,300	8,592,700
1969	16,737,100	8,347,400	8,389,700
1968	16,343,100	8,156,600	8,186,500
1967	15,938,400	7,960,000	7,978,500
1966	15,516,600	7,752,700	7,763,900
1965	15,128,500	7,568,200	7,560,200
1964	14,790,100	7,408,000	7,382,000
1963	14,470,600	7,260,100	7,210,500
1962	14,186,200	7,129,800	7,056,400

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE A2

PERSONS CHARGED WITH ALL CHARGES[1], BY LEGISLATIVE CATEGORY AND SEX, CANADA, 1962-1978

YEAR	ALL CHARGES[1]			CRIMINAL CODE			DRUG FEDERAL STATUTES			OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES			PROVINCIAL STATUTES			MUNICIPAL BY-LAWS		
	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F
1978	797334	703272	94062	396661	338135	58526	51340	45864	5476	33656	30313	3343	289212	266362	22850	26465	22598	3867
1977	774078	686199	87879	379338	326337	53001	57999	52179	5820	30446	27536	2910	278571	256218	22353	27724	23929	3795
1976	736578	651845	84733	368750	316242	52508	55857	50034	5823	24740	22267	2473	259928	239597	20331	27303	23705	3598
1975	720327	641819	78508	345099	298294	46805	46515	41855	4660	21539	19540	1999	279157	257270	21887	28017	24860	3157
1974	686779	613846	72933	316133	273499	42634	50530	45329	5201	22380	20330	2050	267430	247848	19582	30306	26840	3466
1973	643874	573507	70367	297409	257712	39697	45876	40273	5603	21368	19741	1627	242119	223119	19000	37102	32662	4440
1972	579328	520022	59306	267410	234077	33333	23329	20403	2926	21139	19572	1567	226348	209530	16818	41102	36440	4662
1971	576919	518541	58378	259449	228156	31293	16397	14587	1810	21897	20328	1569	236024	217763	18261	43152	37707	5445
1970	571262	517613	53649	248589	221525	27064	13462	11775	1687	21457	19963	1494	242620	224741	17879	45134	39609	5525
1969	574505	524652	49853	228257	205637	22620	6199	5405	794	31697	29255	2442	260995	242894	18101	47357	41461	5896
1968	557164	509639	47525	217802	197242	20560	3287	2753	534	28626	26325	2301	254823	236373	18450	52626	46946	5680
1967	554390	505221	49169	194881	175653	19228	1875	1455	420	26068	23680	2388	275567	254413	21154	49972	43993	5979
1966	520979	474758	46221	182568	164531	18037	809	622	187	26753	24377	2376	264843	243834	21009	46006	41394	4512
1965	483994	441303	42691	170855	154744	16111	637	406	231	21826	20096	1730	249239	228613	20626	41437	37444	3993
1964	454560	416484	38076	173973	158543	15430	498	326	172	22664	21046	1618	223468	205511	17957	33957	31058	2899
1963	421244	387014	34230	156787	144180	12607	549	372	177	19525	18176	1349	200807	184422	16385	43576	39864	3712
1962	391326	360862	30464	146151	135147	11004	526	366	160	23323	21243	2080	180520	166546	13974	40806	37560	3246

[1] See notes in Table 1 for this category as well as the others.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE A3

PERSONS CHARGED WITH SELECTED PROPERTY OFFENCES[1], BY SEX, CANADA, 1962-1978

YEAR	PROPERTY CRIME INDEX			BREAKING AND ENTERING			THEFT OVER $200			THEFT UNDER $200			THEFT-MOTOR VEHICLE			FRAUD			STOLEN GOODS		
	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F
1978	177835	145357	32478	60911	58069	2842	12768	11214	1554	85105	57979	27126	19051	18095	956	28129	21463	6666	14420	12612	1808
1977	167937	139670	28267	57969	55474	2495	11632	10327	1305	78803	55270	23533	19533	18599	934	25618	19846	5772	13616	12031	1585
1976	170605	140794	29811	57230	54740	2490	11068	9794	1274	82897	57639	25258	19410	18621	789	24065	19102	4963	13164	11654	1510
1975	162216	135804	26412	54235	52076	2159	10239	9115	1124	77665	55334	22331	20077	19279	798	21746	17618	4128	12063	10787	1276
1974	143947	120834	23113	46157	44329	1828	9572	8612	960	69389	49715	19674	18829	18178	651	19299	15313	3986	11079	9931	1148
1973	130088	109754	20334	40601	38934	1667	8595	7891	704	64927	47523	17404	15965	15406	559	18777	15281	3496	10309	9321	988
1972	121686	103585	18101	36858	35618	1240	15808	13856	1952	53882	39433	14449	15138	14678	460	17899	14676	3223	10245	9253	992
1971	120432	103324	17108	36512	35327	1185	17888	15943	1945	52127	38568	13559	13905	13486	419	17436	14826	2610	9965	9145	820
1970	113346	99085	14261	34777	33727	1050	17159	15471	1688	47457	36255	11202	13953	13632	321	16768	14440	2328	9045	8390	655
1969	101699	90605	11094	33283	32408	875	14275	12960	1315	40362	31744	8618	13779	13493	286	14624	12752	1872	7890	7371	519
1968	93584	84013	9571	29534	28822	712	12713	11646	1067	38691	31169	7522	12646	12376	270	12689	11291	1398	6816	6333	483
1967	81281	72211	9070	24419	23782	637	11118	9998	1120	34231	27141	7090	11513	11290	223	10929	9684	1245	5743	5331	412
1966	75823	67493	8330	22042	21431	611	10811	9817	994	32741	26230	6511	10229	10015	214	10501	9294	1207	4930	4603	327
1965	71881	64785	7096	21474	20967	507	9966	9077	889	29958	24459	5499	10483	10282	201	9637	8593	1044	4697	4365	332
1964	71239	64989	6250	21884	21421	463	9387	8682	705	29212	24331	4881	10756	10555	201	10433	9444	989	4772	4455	317
1963	67347	62345	5002	21341	20914	427	9387	8683	704	26985	23260	3725	9634	9488	146	10195	9234	961	4672	4387	285
1962	61625	57746	3879	18796	18438	358	9802	9161	641	23869	21169	2700	9158	8378	180	9921	9164	757	4058	3857	201

[1] See notes in Table 2.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE A4

PERSONS CHARGED WITH SELECTED VIOLENT OFFENCES[1], BY SEX, CANADA, 1962-1978

YEAR	VIOLENT CRIME INDEX			SERIOUS VIOLENT			MURDER			MANSLAUGHTER			WOUNDING			ROBBERY			OTHER ASSAULTS		
	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F
1978	47227	42498	4729	9833	8959	874	558	487	71	54	47	7	1773	1496	277	7502	6976	526	37340	33492	3848
1977	45765	41347	4418	9846	8972	874	542	479	63	56	46	10	1698	1420	278	7606	7073	533	35863	32329	3534
1976	44264	40093	4171	9256	8456	800	504	436	68	55	46	9	1603	1376	227	7149	6644	505	34953	31591	3362
1975	42748	38878	3870	9460	8654	806	494	426	68	61	49	12	1544	1295	249	7422	6933	489	33227	30175	3052
1974	44195	37642	3553	8185	7480	705	463	404	59	60	49	11	1570	1339	231	6152	5737	415	32950	30113	2837
1973	38989	35585	3404	7091	6414	677	405	356	49	65	57	8	1483	1232	251	5203	4826	377	31833	29114	2719
1972	35658	32943	2715	6311	5826	485	395	336	59	41	37	4	1340	1153	187	4576	4337	239	29306	27080	2226
1971	34590	32110	2480	6095	5594	501	368	327	41	47	42	5	1319	1139	180	4408	4128	280	28448	26474	1974
1970	32971	30783	2188	5930	5458	472	314	281	33	38	35	3	1173	1004	169	4443	4173	270	27003	25290	1713
1969	30029	28148	1881	5189	4804	385	277	234	43	43	38	5	1188	1040	148	3724	3530	194	24797	23306	1491
1968	28395	26640	1755	4745	4388	357	261	232	29	54	47	7	1020	870	150	3464	3286	178	23596	22205	1391
1967	25906	24516	1390	3807	3572	235	197	182	15	53	48	5	681	600	81	2929	2790	139	22046	20896	1150
1966	24710	23207	1503	3460	3255	205	201	175	26	28	19	9	643	561	82	2616	2519	97	21222	19933	1289
1965	22115	20858	1257	3183	2940	243	172	154	18	36	30	6	616	536	80	2395	2250	145	18896	17888	1008
1964	20665	19614	1051	3371	3172	199	167	149	18	34	30	4	616	539	77	2588	2484	104	17260	16412	848
1963	18489	17494	995	2932	2747	185	186	172	14	42	41	1	613	549	64	2133	2026	107	15515	14706	809
1962	17018	16147	871	2833	2674	159	150	133	17	46	43	3	614	541	73	2069	2000	69	14139	13430	709

[1] See notes in Table 3.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

TABLE A5

PERSONS CHARGED WITH SELECTED SERIOUS AND NON-SERIOUS (PETTY) TYPES OF OFFENCES[1], CANADA, 1962-1978

YEAR	SELECTED SERIOUS CRIMES									PETTY PROPERTY CRIMES					
	Total			Without Theft			Without Theft Under $200			Total			Without Theft Over $200		
	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F
1978	187668	154316	33352	89795	85123	4672	102563	96337	6226	126002	90656	35346	113234	79442	33792
1977	177783	148642	29141	87348	83045	4303	98980	93372	5608	116053	85443	30610	104421	75116	29305
1976	179861	149250	30611	85896	81817	4079	96964	91611	5353	118030	86535	31495	106962	76741	30221
1975	171676	144458	27218	83772	80009	3763	94011	89124	4887	109650	82067	27583	99411	72952	26459
1974	152132	128314	23818	73171	69987	3184	82743	78599	4144	98260	73640	24620	88688	65028	23660
1973	137179	116168	21011	63657	60754	2903	72252	68645	3607	92299	70695	21604	83704	62804	20900
1972	127997	109411	18586	58307	56122	2185	74115	69978	4137	87589	67965	19624	71781	54109	17672
1971	126527	108918	17609	56512	54407	2105	74400	70350	4050	87451	69337	18114	69563	53394	16169
1970	119276	104543	14733	54660	52817	1843	71819	68288	3531	81384	66166	15218	64225	50695	13530
1969	106888	95409	11479	52251	50705	1546	66526	63665	2861	69261	57456	11805	54986	44496	10490
1968	98329	88401	9928	46925	45586	1339	59638	57232	2406	64093	54106	9987	51380	42460	8920
1967	85088	75783	9305	39739	38644	1095	50857	48642	2215	56278	46823	9455	45160	36825	8335
1966	79283	70748	8535	35731	34701	1030	46542	44518	2024	54053	45341	8712	43242	35524	7718
1965	75064	67725	7339	35140	34189	951	45106	43266	1840	49561	42129	7432	39595	33052	6543
1964	74610	68161	6449	36011	35148	863	45398	43830	1568	49032	42457	6575	39645	33775	5870
1963	70279	65092	5187	33907	33149	758	43294	41832	1462	46567	41177	5390	37180	32494	4686
1962	64458	60420	4038	30787	30090	697	40589	39251	1338	43592	39494	4098	33790	30333	3457

[1] See notes in Table 12.

Sources: See Table of Sources.

3819 - 104 Street,
Edmonton, Alberta. T6J 2J9
Canada.
April 11, 1984.

Social Forces,
The University of North Carolina Press,
P.O. Box 2288,
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
U.S.A.

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am currently completing a Master's degree at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. My thesis is entitled "Canadian Trends in Selected Female Crimes: An Adapted Replication Study", the methodology therein based on the work of Darrell J. Steffensmeier at Pennsylvania State University. At this time, however, I am writing to you regarding permission to replicate portions of Steffensmeier's article appearing in Volume 57, Number 2 of Social Forces (1978) on pages 566 to 584.

Part of my data analysis includes a direct comparison between Canadian data for selected property crimes and comparable American data published in the above article entitled "Crime and the Contemporary Woman: An Analysis of Changing Levels of Female Property Crime, 1960-75". Since your journal holds the copyright for this article, I request your permission to replicate Tables 1, 3, and 4 contained therein as well as the formulae used to compute arrest rates and the differences between the sexes in the average annual rates. These tables will therefore be incorportated into the body of my thesis.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I shall look forward to hearing from you at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

J. E. Fisher

JEF

J.E. Fisher,
Graduate Studies.

OK
Norma E. Sofich
Managing Editor

Sociological Focus
Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242

Editors
Bebe Lavin
Elizabeth I. Mullins
(216) 672-2749

15 June 1984

J. E. Fisher
3819 - 104 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T6J 2J9
Canada

Dear Mr. Fisher:

You are granted permission to replicate the tables and formulae from the article, "Trends in Female Violence, 1960-1977," authored by Darrell J. Steffensmeier, R. H. Steffensmeier, and Alvin S. Rosenthal published in volume 12, no. 3 of Sociological Focus.

Sincerely,

Bebe Lavin

Bebe Lavin

Elizabeth I. Mullins

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
201 LIBERAL ARTS TOWER
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA 16802

College of the Liberal Arts
Department of Sociology

Area Code 814
865-2527

August 19, 1983

Ms. Joan Fisher
104 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada 26J2J9

Dear Ms. Fisher:

Please be informed of my permission to include in your Masters thesis reproductions of the following two articles:

"Crime and the contemporary woman: An analysis of changing levels of female property crime, 1960-75." Social Forces (1978) 57:566-584.

"Trends in female violence, 1960-1977." Sociological Focus (1979), 12:217-227. (with Renee Hoffman Steffensmeier and Alvin Rosenthal)

Best of luck with your research. I look forward to seeing your report.

Sincerely,

Darrell J. Steffensmeier (das)

Darrell J. Steffensmeier
Associate Professor of Sociology

DJS/das